

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Evangelická teologická fakulta

Písemná bakalářská práce

Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Evangelická teologická fakulta

Bakalářská práce
Eklesiologické názory Rogera Haighta S.J.

Autor: Lukáš Kratochvíl

Institut ekumenických studií

Vedoucí práce: Doc. Ivana Noble Ph.D.

Prof. Dr. Peter De Mey

Studijní program: Teologie křesťanských tradic

Rok odevzdání: 2009

Poděkování:

Rád bych poděkoval Doc. Ivaně Noble Ph.D. a Prof. Dr. Petru De Meyovi z Katolické teologické fakulty z Katolické university v Lovani za cenné poznatky, komentáře a připomínky při psaní této práce.

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci s názvem Eklesiologické názory Rogera Haighta S.J. napsal samostatně a výhradně s použitím citovaných pramenů.

V Praze dne 7.6.2009

Lukáš Kratochvíl

Obsah

1.EKLESIOLOGICKÉ NÁZORY ROGERA HAIGHTA S.J.	1
1.1.Úvod	1
1.2.Eklesiologie v dnešní době.....	1
1.3.Metoda eklesiologie.....	2
1.4.Christian Community in History.....	3
1.4.1.Eklesiologie seshora.....	3
1.4.2.Eklesiologie zezdola.....	4
1.5.Principy historické eklesiologie	4
1.6.Závěr.....	6
2.KRITIKA CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY	8
2.1.Úvod	8
2.2.Diskuse o metodě.....	8
2.2.1.Společenství věřících a učení.....	9
2.3.Podstatné prvky církve – autentická církev.....	9
2.4.Jednota a rozmanitost.....	10
2.4.1.Sdílený prostor významu a chování.....	10
2.5.Závěr.....	11
3.PNEUMATOCENTRISMUS A LITURGICKÁ EKLESIOLOGIE	13
3.1.Úvod	13
3.2.Působení Boha jako Ducha v církvi.....	13
3.3.Liturgická eklesiologie.....	14
3.3.1.Shromáždění.....	15
3.3.2.Společenství shromáždění.....	16
3.4.Závěr.....	17
4.ZÁVĚR	18
1.THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL VIEWS OF ROGER HAIGHT SJ	20
1.1.Introduction.....	20
1.2.Ecclsiology in the present-day context.....	20
1.2.1.Method of ecclesiology.....	22
1.3.Christian Community in History - a historically conscious ecclesiology	23
1.3.1.Ecclsiology from above and ecclesiology from below.....	23
1.3.2.Principles of historically conscious ecclesiology.....	26
1.4.Conclusion.....	30
2.CRITIQUE OF CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY	31
2.1.Introduction.....	31

2.2.Ecclesiology from below– a discussion on the method.....	32
2.2.1.The community of faithful and the doctrines.....	33
2.3.Essential elements in the church – authentic church.....	34
2.4.Unity and diversity.....	35
2.4.1.Shared field of meaning or behaviour.....	35
2.5.Conclusion.....	37
<u>3.PNEUMATOCENTRISM AND LITURGICAL ECCLESIOLOGY</u>	38
3.1.Introduction.....	38
3.2.God as Spirit in the Church – addressing the limits.....	38
3.2.1.Ecclesial discernment.....	41
3.3.Liturgical point of view.....	43
3.3.1.Understanding of an assembly.....	43
3.3.2.Communion of assemblies.....	45
3.4.Conclusion	46
<u>4.CONCLUSION</u>	48
<u>1.CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY - ECCLESIAL EXISTENCE</u>	49
1.1.Introduction.....	49
1.2.Transdenominational ecclesiology.....	49
1.2.1.The Object of Transdenominational Ecclesiology.....	50
1.2.2.The Method of Transdenominational Ecclesiology.....	51
1.3.Ecclesial existence.....	52
1.3.1.Spirituality and Ecclesial Existence.....	53
1.3.2.Ecclesial existence and partial communion.....	54
<u>2.CONCLUSION</u>	56
<u>3.SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	58

ANOTACE

Americký jezuita Roger Haight dokončil v roce 2008 třetí svazek svého díla o eklesiologii pod názvem *Christian Community in History*. V prvních dvou svazcích věnovaných historické a komparativní eklesiologii se Haight snaží najít souvislosti a změny v dějinách společnosti a v dějinách církve. Jeho cílem je zachytit církev v její dějinném kontextu, aby mohl postihnout vliv doby na její specifické uspořádání a podobu. Výsledkem tak je empirický soubor principů napomáhajících k úvahám o církvi v kterékoliv době.

Závěrečný svazek Haightova díla pak vychází z těchto principů, a s jejich pomocí se snaží popsat transdenominační církve. Ta jde napříč všemi církvemi, je jejich nejhlubším jádrem a vytváří kontinuitu s apoštolskou církví prvního století. Na základě společného jádra pak Haight argumentuje pro částečné společenství církví. Vyzývá církve, aby na základě toho co mají společného mezi sebou potvrdili částečné společenství, protože to co je pojí je mnohem důležitější než to co je rozděluje.

Haightův závěrečný díl *Christian Community in History* je konstruktivní eklesiologií. Spolu s jeho předchozími publikacemi *Jesus Symbol of God* a *Dynamics of Theology* pak představují pokus zůstat věrný apoštolské víře v dialogu s dnešním světem.

PŘEDMLUVA

Tato bakalářská práce je rozdělena do tří částí, a každá z nich odpovídá jedné eseji. První esej byla napsána během výměnného studijního pobytu Erasmus na katolické teologické fakultě Katolické university v Lovani, kde byla odevzdána v červnu 2007. Tato esej, psaná v angličtině, čerpá zejména ze dvou dílů trilogie *Christian Community in History*¹ amerického jezuita Rogera Haighta. Oba tyto svazky, které byly vydány v roce 2004 a 2005, jsou ve své podstatě dílem z historické a komparativní eklesiologie a jejich záměrem je připravit půdu pro konstruktivní eklesiologii závěrečného dílu. Má esej se snaží se stručně představit a zhodnotit Haightův přístup, a také předpovědět co lze očekávat od závěrečného dílu.

Druhou částí mé bakalářské práce je český překlad eseje napsané v Lovani. Ten byl dokončen počátkem roku 2008. Hned poté ale vydal vydal Roger Haight poslední třetí díl pod názvem *Christian Community in History – Ecclesial Existence*.² Tento svazek je základem pro třetí esej, jejímž cílem je krátce shrnout Haightovu konstruktivní eklesiologii a představit co nového poslední díl trilogie přinesl.

Tato bakalářská práce je podána a bude obhajována v českém akademickém prostředí. Z tohoto důvodu je na začátek zařazena esej psaná v češtině, hned poté následuje původní anglická verze a nakonec esej o posledním díle Haightovy trilogie.

¹ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 1. Historical ecclesiology.* London: Continuum, 2004, a Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. Vol. 2. Comparative ecclesiology.* New York: Continuum, 2005.

² Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 3. Ecclesial Existence.* Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008.

**ČÁST PRVNÍ:
EKLESIOLOGICKÉ NÁZORY ROGERA HAIGHTA S.J.**

ÚVOD

Americký jezuita Roger Haight napsal v roce 2004 a 2005 dva svazky o eklesiologii pod názvem *Christian Community in History – Historical Ecclesiology*³ a *Christian Community in History – Comparative Ecclesiology*.⁴ Po jeho dvou dílech *Dynamics of Theology*⁵ a *Jesus, Symbol of God*⁶ má být *Christian Community in History* systematickou či konstruktivní eklesiologií. Je esejem o eklesiologii a jejím cílem je popsat změny a souvislosti v dějinách společnosti a v dějinách církve. Haight se snaží zachytit církev v její dějinném kontextu, aby mohl postihnout vliv doby na její specifické uspořádání a podobu.⁷ Výsledkem tak je empirický soubor principů napomáhajících k úvahám o církvi v kterékoliv době.⁸

Cílem mé práce je představit eklesiologické názory Rogera Haighta S.J.. V první kapitole se proto především zaměřím na klíčové pojmy a myšlenky jeho z dvou svazků *Christian Community in History*, i když budu čerpat z prací, které autor publikoval předtím. Druhá kapitola pak shrnuje kritiku, která se zmíněnému dílu dostala a třetí kapitola nabídne alternativní pohled na eklesiologii prostřednictvím liturgické eklesiologie.

³ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 1. Historical ecclesiology*. London: Continuum, 2004.

⁴ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 2. Comparative ecclesiology*. New York: Continuum, 2005.

⁵ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Dynamics of Theology*. New York: Orbis Books. Maryknoll, 2001.

⁶ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Jesus, Symbol of God*. New York: Orbis Books. Maryknoll, 1999.

⁷ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 1. s. 17.*

⁸ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 1. s. 3.*

1. EKLESIOLOGICKÉ NÁZORY ROGERA HAIGHTA S.J.

1.1. Úvod

Dva klíčové pojmy Haightovy eklesiologie jsou *historická eklesiologie* – tj. eklesiologie, která bere v potaz dějiny a jejich vliv na vývoj a sebeporozumění církve; a *eklesiologie zezdola* – představující typ eklesiologického myšlení začínající u společenství věřících. Ve snaze objasnit tyto klíčové pojmy se nejdříve zaměřím na podmínky ovlivňující eklesiologii a její metodu v dnešní době.

K popsání principů historické eklesiologie používá Haight protiklad mezi zmíněnou eklesiologií zezdola a eklesiologií seshora. Na tomto vztahu pak vyniká jeho porozumění církvi, ve kterém do popředí vystupují tři témata. Prvním je dvojice jednota a rozmanitost, druhým je autorita a úřad církve založené ve společenství a vycházející ze společenství. Posledním tématem je pak pneumatocentrismus.⁹

1.2. Eklesiologie v dnešní době

Eklesiologie je ovlivňovaná množstvím faktorů. V současné době lze mluvit zejména o vědomí dějinného podmínění (historické povědomí), které vyzdvihuje charakter církve jako vyvíjející se organizace. Pozitivní vnímání jiných církví a náboženství, ocenění Boží milosti v nich pracujících, pak narušuje každý obraz výlučnosti.¹⁰ Napětí mezi univerzálním a lokálním, které přinesla globalizace, vytváří cestu a zároveň klade výzvy inkulturaci. Lidské utrpení, kterého bylo dvacáté století svědkem ve velké míře, požaduje věrohodnou odpověď církve utvářené Ježíšovými hodnotami spravedlnosti a Království Božího. Podobnou výzvu přináší i situace žen v církvi. Klesající počet lidí na bohoslužbách pak přeměňuje sebe-porozumění církve směrem k dobrovolné organizaci, kde členství nemůže být vynuceno. Podle Haighta, všechny zmíněné faktory požadují eklesiologii, která si je vědomá svého dějinného podmínění, a která je schopna na tyto výzvy věrohodně odpovědět.

Tyto faktory ovlivňují jak objekt eklesiologie tak její metodu, a zdůrazňují vliv kontextu, ve kterém je eklesiologie tvořena. Církev jako objekt eklesiologie by tak měla být chápána jako empirická církev, jako konkrétní lidské společenství existující v dějinách.¹¹ Objektem

⁹ Zároveň je potřeba přiznat, že způsob jakým prezentuji Haightovy myšlenky nebere příliš v úvahu jejich dějinnou podmíněnost, nicméně, vzhledem k rozsahu této eseje je potřeba toto riziko podstoupit.

¹⁰ „Rozmanitost náboženství není zlo, které je potřeba odstranit, ale spíše bohatství pro všechny...“ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 30.

¹¹ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 37.

eklesiologie je pak celá, univerzální církev, resp. celé křesťanské hnutí, protože rozmanitost a bohatství církve nelze omezit na jednu církevní denominaci.¹² Vzhledem k rozdělení církve nelze mluvit o jednotné eklesiologii, a Haight tvrdí, že eklesiologie ani nikdy jednotná nebude. „Žádné eklesiologie není schopná zachytit celou církev“.¹³ Je potřeba uvažovat o rozmanitosti eklesiologií, protože lokální situace církve, historické podmínky a kontext ovlivňují postoje, předpoklady, porozumění a metody přístupu církví k samým sobě i k univerzální církvi¹⁴

1.3. Metoda eklesiologie

Historická eklesiologie se zaměřuje na konkrétní církevní společenství v dějinách, které se vyvíjí v čase. I když jej lze vnímat jako společenské hnutí, toto společenství vnímá samo sebe skrze víru jako reakci na Boží jednání. Proto metoda, již má historická eklesiologie použít, musí vést k úplnému porozumění církve a k porozumění lidem v dnešní době. Haight zdůrazňuje následující roviny – eklesiologie podle něj musí být dějinná, teologická, apologetická a hermeneutická.

Metoda eklesiologie tedy musí vzít v potaz skutečnost, že církev je instituce z tohoto světa.¹⁵ Má svůj původ v dějinách a vyvíjí se po staletí. Ve snaze jí porozumět je potřeba studovat její dějiny a jednání od počátku – způsob jakým církev reagovala na jednotlivé výzvy a problémy s jimiž se potýkala. V tomto procesu je potřeba uplatnit výsledky historie, sociologie, sociální psychologie, antropologie a disciplin zabývajících se managementem.

O církvi ale nelze mluvit jenom jako o společenské a dějinné instituci. Je společenstvím víry, její sebeporozumění vzniklo milostí Boží a toto sebeporozumění musí být v eklesiologii zohledněno. Její vztah k Bohu lze vnímat skrze vztah ke světu, společnosti, dějinám, a zároveň vztah ke světu lze vnímat skrze vztah církve k Bohu.¹⁶

Výrazem apologetický pak Haight míní: „kritickou metodu která se snaží osvětlit víru vlastního společenství“¹⁷ navenek. Proto jazyk, který toto společenství užívá, nemůže být omezen na toto jednotlivé společenství, anebo na skupinu „těch, kteří vědí“ Tento aspekt je má důsledky jak pro

¹² I když bere Haight v potaz celou církev, je si zároveň vědom svého zakotvení v jedné tradici, protože nikdo nemůže být členem univerzální církve – pokaždé je to nějaká místní církev, která formuje naše porozumění celku, a není dost dobře možné být členem univerzální církve. Vztah mezi místní a univerzální církvi je pak potřeba mít neustále na mysli, a místní církevní společenství je neustále konfrontováno s myšlenkou univerzální církve.

¹³ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 44.

¹⁴ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 17.

¹⁵ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281. s. 269

¹⁶ Ibid. s. 270

¹⁷ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 270.

ekumenické vztahy, tak pro dialog s lidmi bez vyznání. Zejména pokud chce církev komunikovat se světem, který je v tak veliké míře pluralistický.¹⁸

Metoda eklesiologie musí být i hermeneutická. Měla by kriticky přinášet sebeporozumění církve z minulých staletí do současnosti věrnou a citlivou interpretací. Věrnost tradici církve ale nelze zachovat opakováním stejných myšlenek a struktur. Ty, protože vznikly v jiné době, jsou pokaždé již nějak interpretovány a je jim nějak rozuměno. Toto porozumění je pak nutně jiné než jejich porozumění v minulosti. Co je potřeba, je jejich interpretace do kontextu dnešní církve a dnešní doby. Haight píše, že „pravda vyžaduje, abychom potvrdili co církev je a může být dnes“.¹⁹

1.4. Christian Community in History

K popsání principů historické eklesiologie Haight používá protiklad mezi eklesiologií seshora a eklesiologií zezdola. Tyto typy eklesiologie představují spíše dva protikladné přístupy k církvi a způsoby eklesiologického myšlení, dvě abstraktní konstrukce, které neodpovídají žádné skutečné eklesiologii.²⁰ Je pravděpodobnější, že v každé církvi lze najít charakteristiky obou typů.

1.4.1. Eklesiologie seshora

Eklesiologie seshora je typická určitou ahistoricitou.²¹ Snaží se zachytit neměnnou podstatu církve způsobem, který překračuje každý kontext a odmítá vědomí dějinné podmíněnosti. Podle eklesiologie seshora je církev doktrinálně jedna a obraz univerzální církve je tak utvářen podle ní samé.²² I když tato církev nemusí být nezbytnou podmínkou spásy, je jistě vrcholem všech církevních forem a uspořádání, je nadřazená všem ostatním, protože je založená na Kristu jako jejím středu.²³ Církev jako instituce je v této formě chtěná Bohem a odpovídá jeho vůli.²⁴

¹⁸ Jazyk, který církev užívá by podle Haighta měl oslovit obecnou lidskou zkušenost. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 47

¹⁹ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281. s. 272.

²⁰ Roger Haight, (S.J.), *Towards an Ecclesiology From Below*, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, s. 414.

²¹ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 18.

²² Ibid. s. 20.

²³ Ibid. s. 23.

²⁴ Ve své radikální formě eklesiologie seshora uvádí citáty z Písma jako důkazy podporující její autoritu. Tato eklesiologie je exkluzivní například i tím, že určuje hranice k rozlišení pravé církve od každé jiné chybující organizace a snaží se jasně určit své hranice. Je potřeba zdůraznit, že každá církev má jisté prvky (v té nebo oné míře vytváří svou) eklesiologie seshora, i když nemusí převažovat, nebo je

1.4.2. Eklesiologie zezdola

Eklesiologie zezdola představuje metodu, která je „konkrétní, existenciální a historická“.²⁵ Ve snaze odpovědět na dnešní výzvy se tato eklesiologie v první řadě zaměřuje na empirickou organizaci či společenství – církev je vnímána jako historicko-sociologická realita a k jejímu zkoumání lze uplatnit společenské vědy.²⁶ Toto společenství je ale mnohem více, protože církev je zažívána i nábožensky či teologicky jako odpověď na Boží jednání. Eklesiologie zezdola si je vědomá teologické roviny a vztahu církve k Bohu. Snaží se vysvětlit víru, která je zachycena v učení církve, a zároveň bere v potaz víru, kterou církev věří nyní.²⁷

Eklesiologie seshora tedy začíná nebo argumentuje autoritou, a z této pozice se snaží zdůvodnit formu církve jako danou a chtěnou Boží prozřetelností. V protikladu k ní, eklesiologie zezdola začíná zkušeností konkrétního křesťanského společenství, a od něj se skrze historickou a sociologickou analýzu posouvá k teologickému porozumění církvi.

1.5. Principy historické eklesiologie

Dva svazky *Christian Community in History* popisují hlavní události a rozhodující okamžiky v dějinách církve od jejích počátků až po dnešní situaci.²⁸ Struktura jednotlivých kapitol je následující. Autor začíná historickým popisem hlavních událostí ve vybraném úseku dějin církve. Po sociologické a teologické analýze je církev popsána v následujících bodech: (1) organizační struktura, (2) členství v církvi, (3) mise církve, (4) její aktivity a (5) vztah církve ke světu. Následně pak Haight formuluje principy historické eklesiologie. Ve druhém svazku, po popisu daného historického období a jeho hlavních výzev, kterým musela církev čelit, Haight prezentuje hlavní myšlenky vybraných autorů a jejich tradice podle podobného schématu.

V pozadí principů historické eklesiologie lze identifikovat tři hlavní témata. První je možné

sdílená jenom malou skupinou jejich věřících. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 19

²⁵ Ibid, s. 4.

²⁶ Církev existuje ve světě, ne mimo něj. Proto kategorie a způsoby myšlení každodenního života tvoří zdroj zkušenosti, slovníku a porozumění křesťanského společenství. Na druhé straně lze sledovat vliv kulturních forem na sebeporozumění církve. Ibid, s. 59.

²⁷ Eklesiologie zezdola se vyznačuje silným smyslem pro dějinnou podmíněnost. Je si vědoma změn, kterými církev prošla v dějinách a snaží se ukázat jejich dosah a důvody. Zároveň bere v potaz zvláštnosti té nebo oné církve, protože nelze myslet, že jediná církev může nést a reprezentovat plnost křesťanského života a jeho forem v jediné organizační formě. eklesiologie zezdola má za svůj objekt celé křesťanské hnutí a ne jenom jednu tradici. Ibid.. s. 58.

²⁸ První svazek začíná situací prvních křesťanů jako sekty v židovství a končí konciliaristickým hnutím a pozdně středověkou církvi. Ve druhém svazku autor mění strategii a od historické eklesiologie se posouvá ke komparativní eklesiologii. Popisuje církev od reformací šestnáctého století až po století dvacáté a formuluje výzvy, kterým bude církev čelit ve století jednadvacátém.

popsat dvojicí jednota a rozmanitost – jednota chápána jako opak jednotvárnosti, uniformity, která vytváří prostor pro odlišnosti, pluralitu názorů, myšlenek a církevních forem. Druhým konceptem je autorita mající svůj základ ve společenství. Je chápána jako funkce společenství - princip funkcionality pak odpovídá způsobu jakým jsou vytvářeny úřady církve vzhledem k potřebám společenství. Pneumatocentrismus je klíčový výraz pro třetí koncept Haightova přístupu. Bůh jako Duch svatý v církvi je jeden ze základů církve, a také Haightovy eklesiologie.²⁹

Jednota a pluralita

Církev byla ve svém počátku jedna, a už od jejího vzniku měla jednota velkou hodnotu. Jednalo-li se o místní církve, regionální církve a v menší míře i o celé křesťanské hnutí. Po mnohých rozděleních, které se udály v dějinách, byla otázka jednoty opět přinesena do popředí skrze negativní zkušenost dvou světových válek a neschopností církví dostát své misi zapříčiněnou četnými rozděleními.

V současnosti již není možné mluvit o jednotě křesťanství definované bez vědomí a respektu k vzájemným odlišnostem.³⁰ Podle Haighta, nové chápání křesťanské jednoty musí zahrnovat jednotlivé tradice a rozdílné identity denominací.³¹ Jednota je ze své podstaty myšlena s pluralizmem – spolu vytváří dvojici, která je v neustálém napětí.

Rozdíly mezi církevními strukturami a kulturní rozdíly nejsou nepřekonatelné a lze uvažovat o jisté míře legitimní odlišnosti mezi církvemi. Například vztah církve ke světu, státu a společnosti bude mít různé podoby.³² Uznání odlišností však nemůže vést k uspokojení se současnými rozděleními a je potřeba se vyhnout chápání jednoty čistě eschatologicky. I když rozdíly mezi církvemi existují, nejsou schopny zastínit onu teologickou rovinu jednoty – kde církev je jedna ve své víře v Boha zprostředkované skrze Ježíše Krista.³³ Jednota musí být

²⁹ Haight používá výrazu Bůh jako Duch svatý [God as Spirit] k zvýraznění postavení Ducha svatého v Trojici.

³⁰ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 2. s. 212.

³¹ Cyprián z Kartága, který svou schopností přitakat jednotě i přes značné rozdíly mezi místními církvemi je pro Haighta významným příkladem. Cyprián zastával názor, že místní církve může být jenom jedna, zároveň si ale byl vědom odpovědnosti za jednotu celku. Pragmaticky přitakal společenství [communion] přes četné rozdíly, i když „sakramentální teologie a praxe byly velice důležité, protože v nich šlo o hodně“. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 192

³² Církev je v neustálém kontaktu se svým prostředím, žije ve světě. Přivlastnění si Božího zjevení musí zahrnovat přizpůsobení současné dějinné situaci a úsilí zůstat věrný novozákonní církvi, která by měla být základní referencí. Koncept pluralismu zahrnuje uznání, že jednotlivé církve v dějinách odpovídají různě na tento úkol.

³³ Roger Haight (S.J.), “On Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, Fall (1992): 220-238. s. 230.

pojata jako konkrétní a naléhavý úkol.

Autorita vycházející ze společenství

Podle eklesiologie zezdola vznikají církevní struktury v rámci společenství, a jsou chápány ve smyslu jeho organického vývoje a růstu. Jsou vytvořeny pro potřeby společenství a mají napomáhat k jeho blahobytu.³⁴ V eklesiologii zezdola je zdroj autority církve založen ve společenství věřících a autorita je chápána jako jeho funkce. Například papežský úřad lze funkčně a teologicky vnímat jako Duchem inspirovanou potřebu zachovat jednotu. Zároveň však může Duch inspirovat i jiné uspořádání církevních struktur.

Pneumatocentrismus

Pojem autority vycházející ze společenství je založen na předpokladu, že Bůh je přítomen v jeho středu. Zkušenost s Božím jednáním je lépe vyjádřena symbolem Boha jako Ducha svatého, který doprovází, oživuje a vede církve.³⁵ Eklesiologie seshora je zaměřená kristocentricky a Kristus je chápán jako zakladatel církve. Zdůrazňuje věrnost tradici předávanou po staletí, kde je každá změna přijímána jenom velice opatrně. Eklesiologie zezdola je zaměřená pneumatocentricky, a Ježíše zdůrazňuje spíše jako historický zdroj, jako počátek tradice, ze které vznikla církev. Volá po kreativní interpretaci tradice, protože život v měnícím se světě neustále přináší nové změny, na které je potřeba věrohodně reagovat. Eklesiologie zezdola spočívá na předpokladu, že není možné být věrný tradici bez kreativity.³⁶

1.6. Závěr

Cílem dvou svazků *Christian Community in History* je vytvořit hypotézy pro konstruktivní analýzu církve v teologickém jazyce úzce spojeném s historickou zkušeností. Metoda historické

³⁴ Princip funkcionality neslouží pouze k vysvětlení jak nastaly jisté změny a proč se církve vyvíjela tím nebo oním způsobem. Zároveň vytváří podmínky ke kritickému zhodnocení, změnám a k vytvoření nových struktur a úřadů.

³⁵ Mluvení o Bohu jako Duchu svatém přítomném ve společenství předpokládá Boha jednajícího uprostřed a ze společenství, spíše než vnější sílu, která by společenství ovládala. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 53.

³⁶ Pneumatocentrický přístup podporuje inkulturaci, zvláštnosti a má porozumění pro rozličné vyjádření víry. Ve světle současných znalostí byly dogmata, kréda a vyznání předmětem neustálé reinterpretace. Proto rozdíly v doktrínálních vyjádřeních nejsou nutně na překážku, ale raději výrazem bohatství víry. Přijetí těchto rozdílů je potom výrazem důvěry v Boha jako Ducha Svatého působícího v jednotlivých církvích. Rozdíly nejsou vnímány jako cíl, ale jako různá vyjádření jednotlivých společenství existujících v rozdílném prostředí a pravdivě hledajících Boha. Haight zároveň zdůrazňuje, že „Bůh jako Duch Svatý působící v církvích není objektivním principem a nelze se na něj odvolávat v různých historických rozhodnutích a cestách, po kterých se církve vydala.“ Roger Haight, (S.J.), *Towards an Ecclesiology From Below*, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, s. 431.

eklesiologie poskytuje základ pro kritické zhodnocení vývoje církve a přináší do popředí tři základní koncepty: napětí mezi jednotou a rozmanitostí, autoritu pojatou jako funkci společenství a Boží přítomnost v podobě Ducha svatého jednajícího uprostřed společenství.

Tyto koncepty vyvolávají spoustu otázek. Jaká je přijatelná míra plurality? Kde jsou hranice funkcionalistického přístupu? A co všechno si může nárokovat inspiraci Duchem svatým? Haight si je vědom těchto otázek. Funkcionalistický přístup a přizpůsobování se novým podmínkám je nevyhnutně spojen s věrností minulosti a s tradicí, která je také neustále poměřována s novozákonní církví.³⁷ Zkušenost Boha jako Ducha svatého pak pro něj neexistuje nezávisle na Ježíši Nazaretském, protože křesťanská zkušenost je vždy kristomorfní – vzpomínka na Ježíše Nazaretského určuje zkušenost s Duchem svatým.³⁸

³⁷ Novozákonní církev je u Haighta považována za důležité měřítko vývoje církve. Její normativita je v principech historické eklesiologie viděna více v logice počátečního vývoje církve, v jeho pragmatické proměnlivosti a citlivosti na rychle se měnící podmínky. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 61.

³⁸ Ibid. s. 14.

2. KRITIKA *CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY*

2.1. Úvod

Ve druhé kapitole se zaměřím na kritiku, které byla vznesena vůči *Christian Community in History*. Mým hlavním zdrojem bude „Review Symposium“ vydané v časopise *Horizons*³⁹, a vznesené námitky se pokusím shrnout ve třech bodech.⁴⁰ První se bude věnovat metodě Haightovy práce a snaží se o objasnění jeho přístupu k církvi. Druhý se týká podstatných prvků církve a snaží se objasnit otázku jejich hranic, která je důležitá pro diskuzi o rozděleních v dějinách. Poslední se pak věnuje otázce jednoty a rozmanitosti.⁴¹

2.2. Diskuse o metodě

Dva svazky díla *Christian Community in History* se věnují hledání změn a souvislostí, které poznamenaly vývoj církve. Principy historicky uvědomělé eklesiologie se pak vztahují k jednotlivým historickým událostem a jsou vybírány podle následujících kritérií: věrnost minulosti, souvislost s dneškem [coherence today] a význam pro budoucnost [empowerment into the future].⁴² Co ale znamená věrnost minulosti, a které minulosti je potřeba být věrný? Wood klade tuto otázku a zajímá ji vztah mezi křesťanským společenstvím a jeho učením. Píše, že eklesiologie zezdola není nikdy v souladu s učením církve, které v jejím chápání Haight nazývá eklesiologií seshora.⁴³ Podle ní křesťanské společenství nikdy nelze oddělit od jeho učení, protože církev je společenství spojené vírou ve vzkříšeného Krista a učení je výrazem jeho víry.

³⁹ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) *Christian Community in History: Four Perspectives*,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386.

⁴⁰ Sympozium nabízí pohled čtyř teologů – dvou žen a dvou mužů z různých denominací: Susan K. Wood, Amy Plantinga Pauw, Richard P. McBrien a Francis A. Sullivan SJ.

⁴¹ Tato kapitola má i své omezení. Nebudu zde diskutovat o přesnosti Haightovy historické analýzy anebo o jeho výběru autorů reprezentujících jednotlivé křesťanské tradice. Také je dobré mít na paměti, že dva Haightovy svazky jsou pracemi v historii eklesiologie a jsou spíše deskriptivní. Roger Haight (S.J.), “Author’s Response,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, p. 389 Paralelní konstruktivní nebo systematická eklesiologie podobná k dílu *Jesus, Symbol of God* přichází až ve třetím svazku nazvaném *Christian Community in History – Ecclesial Existence*, vydaném v polovině února 2008.

⁴² Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 55.

⁴³ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) *Christian Community in History: Four Perspectives*,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386, s. 376.

2.2.1. Společenství věřících a učení

Susan Wood svou kritikou navozuje dojem, že v eklesiologii zezdola je společenství věřících odtržené od učení, a částečně stojí proti němu. Haight se ale nesnaží podkopat autoritu institucionální církve (hierarchical church) nebo učení. Učení chápe jako výraz víry společenství, který je tomuto společenství vlastní, a důrazňuje charakter tohoto vzájemného vztahu.⁴⁴ Pokud eklesiologie zezdola odmítá doktrinální požadavky, pak je to kvůli jejich ahistorické interpretaci, ne kvůli požadavkům jako takovým.⁴⁵

Haightova metoda spíše než o rozdělení mezi společenstvím, institucemi a učením vypovídá o výchozím bodu jeho úvah.⁴⁶ Haight začíná u společenství věřících, zkoumá jeho historický vývoj a snaží se v něm rozlišit jednání Boha jako Ducha Svatého.⁴⁷ Teologický a sociologicko-historický jazyk jsou neoddělitelně spojené ve společenství.⁴⁸ Vztah společenství k Bohu pak poskytuje důležitý opěrný bod a inspiruje ke kritice společenských a historických poměrů církve. Na druhé straně společenská a historická kritika inspiruje teologii.

2.3. Podstatné prvky církve – autentická církev

Druhá skupina výhrad vznesených vůči *Christian Community in History* se zaměřuje na podstatné prvky církve, což je jedna z hlavních otázek eklesiologie snažící se obsáhnout celou církev.⁴⁹ Co jsou podstatné prvky, bez kterých se autentická církev neobejde?⁵⁰ Lze odmítnutí některých z nich posoudit jako tak závažné, že s ním lze odůvodnit rozdělení mezi církvemi?⁵¹

⁴⁴ Učení je funkcí společenství, a je s ním tak neoddělitelně spojeno.

⁴⁵ Podobně, pokud Haight používá sociologicko-historický jazyk k popsání institucí církve, nevyhýbá se tím automaticky jejich doktrinálním požadavkům. I když se může zdát vhodnější mluvit o institucích teologickým jazykem, je potřeba mít na mysli, že instituce jsou již nějak interpretované, už jenom proto, že jsou používány v jiném kontextu, než byly vytvořeny.

⁴⁶ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Author's Response," *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, s. 390.

⁴⁷ Teologický jazyk je potřebný už jenom kvůli povaze předmětu eklesiologie zezdola.

⁴⁸ Užívání dvojího jazyka umožňuje realisticky mluvit o církvi, a volně to lze chápat jako Augustinovo rozdělení mezi viditelnou a neviditelnou církví. Podle Augustina je ve vnější církvi přítomna neviditelná církev vyvolených, o kterých ví jenom Bůh. V reformaci toto rozdělení nabralo jiného významu, neviditelná církev sestává ze stejných lidí, ale tím hlavním je jejich identifikování proti empirické církvi v její institucionální struktuře. V Anglikánské církvi je neviditelná církev tou pravou církví ne jako jádro empirické církve, ale v některých případech právě mimo ni. Ve všech těchto rozdělení jde v té nebo oné míře o snahu realisticky mluvit o církvi ve světě se všemi jejími chybami a nedostatky, a zároveň o její božské dimenzi. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 2. s. 213.

⁴⁹ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Author's Response," *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, s. 391.

⁵⁰ A nejsou některé z těchto podstatných prvků církve ve své formě spíše příčinou rozdělení církve?

⁵¹ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., "Roger Haight, (S.J.) *Christian Community in History: Four Perspectives*," *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386, s. 379.

Například úřad biskupa, je jej potřebné považovat za otázku rozdělovací církve – jak je tomu u římskokatolické a pravoslavné církve?

Eklesiologie zezdola posuzuje instituce podle toho, jestli slouží k dobru společenství věřících, o které se zde v první řadě jedná. Haight uznává úřad biskupa jako „podstatnou a Bohem chtěnou strukturu“, ale zároveň dodává, že jí nelze ospravedlnit jako úřad, který církev rozděluje.⁵² Jeho přístup lze schematicky znázornit v následujících krocích zdůrazňujících roli Ducha svatého:⁵³ (1) Duch svatý jedná v církvi od jejího počátku a inspiroval v dějinách vznik rozličných struktur a úřadů sloužících k dobru církve; (2) tyto vznikly jako výraz lidské svobody, ne však bez inspirace Duchem svatým; (3) co vzniklo s inspirací Ducha svatého může a nemusí být podstatný prvek církve napořád, a Duch svatý může inspirovat jak jejich změnu, tak i odsunutí do ústraní či zrušení. V eklesiologii zezdola je přístup k institucím a úřadům církve otevřen ekumenické diskuzi.⁵⁴

2.4. Jednota a rozmanitost

Jednota křesťanství vyvstává v protikladu s pluralitou jiných náboženství, mezi kterými křesťanství existuje.⁵⁵ Co je ale základem křesťanské jednoty, lze ji definovat pozitivně a kde má tato jednota hranice? Lze najít nějaký jednotící střed, kolem kterého pak lze do určité míry akceptovat odlišnosti? V jistém smyslu eklesiologie zezdola všechny předčasné závěry o jednotícím středu vylučuje.⁵⁶ Nicméně z Haightova přístupu lze učinit některé závěry, přestože v jeho práci nelze najít zřejmý jednotící ekumenický princip.

2.4.1. Sdílený prostor významu a chování

Nejdříve je třeba zdůraznit, že Haightova myšlenka jednoty je ve své podstatě úzce spojená s pluralismem, který pro něj znamená „jednota v rozmanitosti v rámci sdíleného významu nebo

⁵² Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 194.

⁵³ Roger Haight (S.J.), „Author’s Response,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, s. 392.

⁵⁴ V případě biskupského úřadu, společná komparativní eklesiologie jej dokonce může doporučit jako obecně platnou strukturu, jako to lze najít v dokumentu Světové rady církví „*Křest, Eucharistie a Úřad*“ (BEM). World Council of Churches. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper No. 111, the “Lima Text”). Online: http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p2/FO1982_111_en.pdf (27.2.2008), (BEM, „Ministry“, s. 25). Ale zároveň to neznamená odpověď typu ano-ne. Roger Haight (S.J.), „Author’s Response,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, s. 393.

⁵⁵ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 1. s. 19.

⁵⁶ *Christian Community in History* je příprava k více konstruktivnímu dílu, které bude posuzovat normy a směřovat rozdíly při tvoření konstruktivní eklesiologie. Roger Haight (S.J.), „Author’s Response,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, s. 389.

chování.⁵⁷ Haightův pluralismus tak počítá s prostorem pro odlišná vyjádření víry a odlišné uspořádání církve, ale také se základem pro žití těchto odlišností. Tímto společným základem je pro něj dokument Světové rady církví „*Křest, Eucharistie a Úřad*“ (BEM).⁵⁸

Eklesiologie zezdola přijímá pluralismus, inkulturaci a rozmanitost církve od jejího počátku. Amy Plantinga Pauw ale vznáší zajímavou výtku, které poukazuje na meze inkulturace a pluralismu. I přes kulturní rozmanitost, kterou lze najít v římskokatolické církvi, píše Pauw, jsou vnitřní rozdělení v církvích jenom těžce vnímány pozitivně velkou částí křesťanstva.⁵⁹ Také inkulturace, která postrádá kritické zhodnocení tradice může vyústit v „ahistoricismus v novém hávu“.⁶⁰

2.5. Závěr

Wood charakterizuje eklesiologie zezdola jako apologetiku pro funkcionalismus a pluralismus, které se zdají být podtextem Haightova díla.⁶¹ Podle Haighta eklesiologie zezdola vypovídá o výchozím bodu úvah o církvi, kterým je společenství. Život církve, organizační struktura a její instituce jsou posuzovány z hlediska v jakém přispívají k jejímu dobru. Zároveň má Haighta silný smysl pro přítomnost Boha jako Ducha svatého jednajícího uprostřed společenství. Myšlenka jednoty je zkonstruována teologicky jako jednota víry vyjádřené mnoha způsoby⁶² – a eklesiologicky ve vzájemném uznání a ocenění církví.⁶³ Na tomto základě lze poté překonat vzájemné hranice, které jsou zpochybněny do té míry, do jaké vylučují ostatní církve.

⁵⁷ [“Unity in diversity or differences within a shared field of meaning or behaviour.”] Roger Haight (S.J.), “Author’s Response,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397. s. 394.

⁵⁸ Z BEM Haight klade do popředí dva aspekty – sebepřekonání [self-transcendence], jelikož vytvoření Světové rady církví vyžadovalo od zúčastněných církví veliké sebezapření a víru v jednání Boha jako Ducha svatého jak v celé církvi obecně, tak v jednotlivých členských církvích. Druhým aspektem je skutečnost, že autoritu BEM uznalo toliko členských církví, a že je založená na jejich vůli vést společný dialog. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 2. s. 424.

⁵⁹ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian Community in History: Four Perspectives,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386, s. 381.

⁶⁰ Ibid. s. 381 Kritika Pauw je zajímavá i z jiného hlediska. I když odmítá úřad biskupa a papeže v jejich současné formě a považuje je za církvev rozdělující instituce, vyjadřuje potřebu pro pevnou ekleziální pozici či strukturu (proto, aby bylo možné se otevřít se vůči jiným církvím) a zároveň volá po kritickém vztahu k tradici. Oba body jsou spíše zdůrazněny v katolickém stanovisku. Implicitně tak poukazuje na důležité prvky jednoty církve a na možnost ocenění některých institucí i přes hranice denominací.

⁶¹ Ibid.. s. 387.

⁶² Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History*. vol. 2. s. 492.

⁶³ Pauw mluví o posvátnosti tohoto uznání a o hermeneutice velkorysosti směrem k jiným věřícím. Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian Community in History: Four Perspectives,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386, s. 383.

V eklesiologii zedola také není prostor pro odpovědi typu ano-ne, naopak, odpovědi na vyvstávajícími v životě církve jsou hledány v procesu ekumenické diskuse.

3. PNEUMATOCENTRISMUS A LITURGICKÁ EKLESIOLOGIE

3.1. Úvod

Jednota církví a důraz na působení Boha jako Ducha svatého přicházejí s naoko protichůdnými požadavky, jednota vyžaduje společný základ, pneumatocentrismus sebou naopak přináší různorodost. Jak lze oba tyto aspekty sjednotit a najít křehkou rovnováhu mezi jednotou a různorodostí? V třetí kapitole se zaměřím na roli pneumatocentrismu v eklesiologii zezdola a následně představím přístup liturgické eklesiologie k otázce jednoty. Hlavním cílem této kapitoly není kritika Haightova přístupu, ale snaha prozkoumat další cesty, které částečně představují jeho alternativu a částečně jej doplňují podobnými důrazy a závěry.

Pneumatocentrismus je jedním z charakteristických rysů v Haightově eklesiologii, který na působení Boha jako Ducha svatého v církvi staví své závěry. V katolické tradici lze podobný důraz najít například u Yves Congara.⁶⁴ Já se zde krátce zaměřím na dílo pravoslavného teologa Johna D. Zizioulase, které má s Haightovým pneumatocentrismem hodně společného. V knížce *Being as Communion*⁶⁵ se Zizioulas snaží nalézt syntézu mezi Pneumatologií a Christologií, z které pak vypracovává důsledky pro svou eklesiologii. Alternativní přístup k otázce jednoty a jejího základu pak nabízí liturgická eklesiologie. Její výhodou je primární zájem o konkrétní společenství věřících a z toho plynoucí možnost založit jednotu na každodenní praxi [worshipping] modlícího se společenství.

3.2. Působení Boha jako Ducha v církvi

Základní myšlenkou v pozadí *Christian Community in History* je přítomnost a neustálá aktivita Boha jako Ducha svatého uprostřed společenství věřících. Bůh jako Duch svatý jí oživuje a současně doprovází.⁶⁶ Přináší svobodu do života církve a umožňuje rozvíjet místní specifika. Na

⁶⁴ Congar, Yves (O.P.). *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. vol 1. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983, a Congar, Yves (O.P.). *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. vol 2. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

⁶⁵ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

⁶⁶ Tuto myšlenku lze najít již v počátcích církve. Ireneus zdůrazňuje, že se Duch svatý a církve navzájem podmiňují: „Kde je Duch, tam je církve a kde je církve, tam je Duch svatý.“ Podle Nicejsko-Konstantinopolské vyznání víry pak činí Duch svatý církve jednu, svatou, všeobecnou a apoštolskou. Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol 1, (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983): s. 68.

základě víry v působení Ducha je tak možné ocenit odlišný vývoj jednotlivých místních církví a zároveň udržet jednotu,⁶⁷ kterou Duch citlivě uskutečňuje v podobě společenství [communion].⁶⁸

John Zizioulas ve své snaze podrobně rozpracovat důsledky syntézy Christologie a Pneumatologie pro eklesiologii zvyrazňuje eschatologický aspekt církve, kterým doplňuje porozumění církve, jejímu charakteru, jednotě a apostolicitě. Podle něj Duch uvolňuje eklesiologii z historické perspektivy.⁶⁹ Vedle důrazu na historický aspekt církve a její tradici tak Zizioulas vyzdvihuje její eschatologický charakter, kterým ji osvobozuje od spoutání dějinami a vnáší do jejího sebe-porozumění větší míru svobody.⁷⁰

Církevní instituce získávají ikonický charakter, protože jsou odrazem Království Božího.⁷¹ To znamená, že nejsou zakotveny samy v sobě, ale ve svém vztahu k Bohu. Zizioulas samozřejmě uznává, že existují úřady, které mají dobově podmíněný charakter. Ty si ale nemůžou nárokovat absolutní platnost. Dodává, že dějiny nikdy neposkytují dostatečné zdůvodnění existence církevních institucí, i kdyby se odvolávaly na tradici, aspoňtolskou posloupnost, biblický původ nebo dějinnou potřebu.⁷²

3.3. Liturgická eklesiologie

Metoda eklesiologie zezdola a principy historické eklesiologie ukazují pluralitu v církvi již od jejích počátků. Ukazují, že odlišnosti a rozdíly, které pak vznikly v průběhu staletí lze vnímat jako obohacující, i když je není třeba považovat za konečný cíl. Haightova metoda ale nenabízí návod jak konstruktivně přistoupit k základu křesťanské jednoty.

Tento návod lze získat pomocí liturgického přístupu, který se jí v leckterých ohledech podobá. Křesťanské společenství či církev z hlediska liturgické teologie a liturgické eklesiologie je

⁶⁷ Souhra stejnosti a odlišnosti má svůj základ především v trojjediném Bohu a čerpá z teologie Trojice. Stanley J. Grenz, "The Social God and the Relational Self: Toward a Theology of the Imago Dei in the Postmodern Context" *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 24 (2002): 33-57, s. 53.

⁶⁸ Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, s. 17.

⁶⁹ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997, s. 130.

⁷⁰ I Haight připomíná, že působení Ducha svatého je pokaždé kristomorfní, ovlivněné zkušeností historického Ježíše. Roger Haight, (S.J.), *Towards an ecclesiology from below*, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, s. 433.

⁷¹ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, s. 138.

⁷² *Ibid*, s. 138.

shromáždění – konkrétní setkání lidí k bohoslužbě [assembly gathered for worship].⁷³ Je to společenství křesťanů, Boží lid, sociální realita [social reality], která vzniká skrze víru v Krista.⁷⁴ Víra, kterou se teologie snaží osvětlit je víra církve a víra v církvi. V liturgickém přístupu je jí rozuměno jako víře sdílené společenstvím lidí, které se dostává vyjádření skrze shromáždění k bohoslužbě.⁷⁵

3.3.1. Shromáždění

Shromáždění lze rozumět jako sdružení lidí – není to ale každé sdružení lidí, jako například přednáška. Je to spíše setkání, ve kterém má každý účastník svou roli, a ve kterém jsou ve středu pozornosti této společné účasti hlavní záležitosti bohoslužby.⁷⁶ Je to shromáždění kolem čtení Písma, kázání, křtění, chleba a vína eucharistie. Podle Lathropa zažíváme toto shromáždění jako církvev, „jako primární význam tohoto důležitého křesťanského slova“.⁷⁷

V novém Zákoně je nedělní shromáždění popsáno jako shromáždění kolem vzkříšeného Krista s Písmem a kolem stolu, je poznamenáno vylitím Božího Ducha, poznamenáno eschatologickým odpuštěním v *ekklésii*, jako shromáždění se k Ježíšovu zázračnému pokrmu, a jako vyslání k misi shromáždit celý svět.⁷⁸ Nástin těchto událostí, struktura bohoslužby – *ordo* – hraje důležitou roli a je něčím, co křesťané sdílejí.⁷⁹ Navíc základní části liturgické struktury – biblické texty, kázání a svátosti, písně, modlitby, kalendáře a kréda – ve své podstatě vyžadují společenství.⁸⁰

Tato shromáždění mohou být často ovlivněny kulturními normami své doby, podobně jako shromáždění prvotní církve byla ovlivněna strukturou synagogy, nebo rozšířeným shromážděním v domácnosti.⁸¹ Zde se dostává do popředí podobná otázka jaká byla kladena

⁷³ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999. s. 5.

⁷⁴ Ibid s. 5.

⁷⁵ Ibid s. 15.

⁷⁶ „Křesťané, *ekklésia*, se scházeli kolem událostí, které mělo na srdci dávné biblické shromáždění: přítomnost Božího Slova.“ Ibid. s. 39.

⁷⁷ Ibid. s. 43.

⁷⁸ Ibid. s. 40.

⁷⁹ Ibid. s. 40.

⁸⁰ Ibid. s. 49.

⁸¹ Vzorky filosofických společností, dobrovolných sdružení, které byly tak časté v helénistické kultuře – a sloužili jako příklad pro dům-církve. Lathrop říká, že liturgické místo je důležité, a že převaha symbolického významu je obvykle větší než naše kulturní projekce. Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People:*

Haightovi. Kdo rozhoduje, které kulturní prvky je třeba odmítnout a které přeměnit? Lathrop odpovídá jednoduše: „církev“.⁸² Místní shromáždění rozhoduje, životem věrným evangeliu, vnímá jak místní kultura přináší svědectví Bohu. Také ale vnímá, v dialogu s tradicí a minulými generacemi, jak moc dané místo požaduje přeorientování a co vyžaduje odmítnutí.⁸³

3.3.2. Společenství shromáždění

Výraz „shromáždění“ nebo „církev“ je používán pro místní shromáždění, ale také pro více než místní shromáždění, ekumenickou skutečnost křesťanského hnutí. Jejich lingvistické užití v Novém zákoně i v prvních staletích svědčí o univerzální církvi, a tato myšlenka nemůže být odmítnuta. Zároveň nelze místní církev chápat jako slabší emanace univerzální církve či jako nedokonalou místní záležitost vzdálenou od ideálu.⁸⁴

Jak tedy lze chápat jednotu vzhledem k těmto místním často značným odlišnostem? Lathrop navrhuje vzít *ordo* jako základ křesťanské jednoty.⁸⁵ Liturgické shromáždění může být symbolem této jednoty, protože jeho *ordo* je sdílené mezi křesťany. Zároveň lze najít hodně prvků, které překračují hranice denominací, například pořadí slavení Eucharistie a příklady věrného místního rozvinutí/podání, kánon knih Písma, vzory a příklady věrného kázání, eucharistických modliteb ve shromáždění kolem stolu, vzory odpuštění hříchů...⁸⁶ Podle Lathropa jsou znaky společenství mezi církvemi společné vzory, principy a výzvy, ne neměnné texty, a určitě ne celé liturgie.⁸⁷

Jednota neznamená jenom vztahy mezi lidmi v daném shromáždění, ale také vztahy mezi shromážděními, v jednom městě nebo po celém světě.⁸⁸ Lathrop si pak klade důležitou otázku: „co v tomto kontextu, kde ‘my‘ liturgických textů neznamená jenom lidi přítomné v tomto shromáždění, v daném okamihu, ale také ostatní shromáždění a potažmo celý svět?“ Jaké má toto „my“ důsledky a jak ovlivňuje náš vztah k jiným shromážděním?

A Liturgical Ecclesiology. s. 29.

⁸² Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology*. s. 71.

⁸³ Ibid.. s. 71.

⁸⁴ Ibid.. s. 51.

⁸⁵ Lathrop mluví o vzájemném společenství mezi shromážděními.

⁸⁶ Ibid.. s. 58.

⁸⁷ Je potřeba se tázat po plnosti a integritě symbolů vody, slova, chleba, vína, shromáždění, vedení, protože ony vhodně odpovídají jak biblickému významu, tak místní kultuře. Ibid. s. 65.

⁸⁸ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999. s. 5.

3.4. Závěr

Haight i Zizioulas rozumějí roli Boha jako Ducha svatého v církvi podobným způsobem. V Haightově eklesiologii zezdola Duch církev oživuje, doprovází a inspiruje k proměnám. Zizioulas s ním v tomto bodě souhlasí, jeho eklesiologie klade důraz na roli Ducha spíše z eschatologického pohledu a církev a její instituce dostávají radikální eschatologické podmínění.⁸⁹ U Haighta Duch působí více skrze svou přítomnost ve společenství, církevní instituce jsou posuzovány podle míry, ve které přispívají blahobytu společenství.

Liturgická eklesiologie vyzdvihuje konkrétní shromáždění sešlé k bohoslužbě kolem Písma, pokrmu a křtu [bath]. I když nezdůrazňuje historický vývoj, dialog s tradicí je důležitou součástí a bodem, ze kterého je potřeba kriticky hodnotit jednání shromáždění.

Na druhé straně je liturgický přístup radikálnější, ve smyslu, že nabízí širší základ pro jednotu církví, protože se ze své povahy vyhne otázkám struktury a organizace církve. Vnímá jednotu mezi lidmi ve shromáždění, a následně jeho vztahy s jinými shromážděními. Dialog s tradicí a společné prvky, vzory a struktury liturgie vyzdvihují potřebu jednoty více, než je to patrné z principů historické eklesiologie.

Liturgický řád, *ordo*, je schopen nabídnout základ pro křesťanskou jednotu, který je konstruktivnější než zmíněné principy historické eklesiologie, i když v některých bodech vedou oba přístupy ke stejným závěrům. Konkrétní otázky, jako například věrná místní inkulturace liturgie, otázka církevních struktur či podstatných prvků autentické církve, jsou rozhodovány ve společenství – které musí brát v potaz rozměr celé církve.

⁸⁹ Eschatologická povaha institucí znamená, že neustále zívisejí na modlitbě církve. Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, s. 138.

4. ZÁVĚR

Principy historické eklesiologie poskytují základ pro kritické ocenění měnícího se charakteru církve během staletí. Zahrnují myšlenku svobody vyjádření víry a prostor pro rozmanitost, který nutně neprotiřečí jednotě celé církve. Jednotlivé církve jsou spíše pobízeny k vzájemnému ocenění odlišností a k důvěře, že je v nich přítomen, a že v nich jedná Bůh jako Duch svatý.

Dva svazky *Christian Community in History* zatím výslovně nepracují s principem jednoty, a jednota křesťanů vystupuje do popředí v kontrastu s jinými náboženstvími. Haightovy principy historické eklesiologie jsou spíše deskriptivní, ale vytváří pevný základ pro konstruktivní eklesiologii. Mají možnost věrohodně odpovědět na problémy a výzvy, se kterými se církve v dnešní době potýká, mohou dát hodně podnětů k ekumenické diskusi, a respektují tradici církve. Třetí svazek by tak měl přinést konstruktivnější eklesiologii, vycházející z principů historické eklesiologie, založenou na dialogu s tradicí a na společné víře v Ježíše Krista a Boha jako Ducha svatého.

**ČÁST DRUHÁ:
THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL VIEWS
OF ROGER HAIGHT S.J.**

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Faculty of Theology



**THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL VIEWS
OF ROGER HAIGHT S.J.**

Tutor
Prof. Dr. Peter De Mey

Yearly Essay
Bachelor of Theology
and Religious Studies
Presented by
Lukas Kratochvil

FOREWORD

The American Jesuit Roger Haight is currently writing three volumes on ecclesiology, in which he tries to explore the method of "ecclesiology from below". After *Dynamics of Theology*⁹⁰ and *Jesus Symbol of God*⁹¹, this is intended as a work in constructive or systematic ecclesiology. In order to do so, Haight explores in the two published volumes *Christian Community in History - A Historical Ecclesiology* and *Christian Community in History - A Comparative Ecclesiology* the history of ecclesiology, as a necessary step before the expected last volume.

The aim of this work is to present and assess the ecclesiological views of Roger Haight. Therefore, I will mainly draw on the present volumes and will try to assess the potentials and main features of his method. However, I will also make use of other works and articles that the author published before and that uncover many of the currently presented ideas in a more or less elaborated form. The third volume that is about to come, tentatively named *Ecclesial Existence*, then certainly limits the possibilities of a definitive evaluation of the author's views on the church, since they will very much depend on the constructive ecclesiology that is about to come.

⁹⁰ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Dynamics of Theology*. New York: Orbis Books, 2001.

⁹¹ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Jesus Symbol of God*. New York: Orbis Books, 2000.

INTRODUCTION

Christian Community in History is an essay in ecclesiology⁹² and it consists of charting changes and continuities that mark human history and the history of the church. It tries to insert the church into its current context in order implicitly to draw out the influence of the age on the particular forms of the church.⁹³ Its aim is to discern the principles that one can detect constantly at work within the dynamics of the church's history, and which show themselves to be perennial across the history of ecclesiology.⁹⁴ The result is a "more empirically based set of guidelines for reflection on the church" for these will help us to understand the church at any given time.⁹⁵

The work's goal is not ecumenical in the sense that some form of Christian unity constitutes the limit toward which it strives. Rather the work presupposes Christian unity made more apparent by the pluralism of religions in the middle of which all of us now exist. The goal of such ecumenical activity should be "to preserve integral traditions, while at the same time consolidating common Christian identity, in order to provide an open Christian voice in a global, human, interreligious conversation."⁹⁶

This paper is divided into three chapters. The first chapter lays down the ecclesiological views of Roger Haight as expressed in two volumes of *Christian community in History*. The second chapter then deals with the critique that was raised against his recent work. It discusses the questions on the method from below, on the essential elements of the church and the unity of the church. Finally, the third chapter will offer a reflection on pneumatocentrism together with another ecclesiological approach, of liturgical ecclesiology, which can complement and bring into the forefront different aspects other than the ecclesiology from below.

⁹² Ecclesiology is a study of the church in an effort to understand its nature and mission. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 17

⁹³ Ibid, p. 2

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 3

⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 3

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 9

1. THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL VIEWS OF ROGER HAIGHT SJ

1.1. Introduction

The two key terms of Haight's ecclesiology presented in *Christian Community in History* are historically conscious ecclesiology and ecclesiology from below. In their elaboration, the challenges and factors will firstly be introduced that shape ecclesiology in the present-day context that make claims on its method and lead to what can be called historically conscious ecclesiology. Secondly, the focus will be on the method of historically conscious study of the church that answers the demands of our context – an ecclesiology from below – i.e. a method that is concrete, existential and historical.⁹⁷ This will be illuminated by using a contrasting type of ecclesiological thinking – an ecclesiology from above – and the consequences will be drawn from both approaches.

Finally, this chapter will identify more general ideas of the principles for historically conscious ecclesiology presented in both volumes. In order to do so, these will be summarised into three topics: (1) the tensional pair of unity and plurality, (2) the communitarian grounding of authority and ministry and (3) pneumatocentrism. It has to be acknowledged that this way of presenting principles for historically conscious ecclesiology does not pay much attention to their historical conditioning, and thus runs a certain risk of distorting them. However, given to the extent of this work, this risk has to be accepted.

1.2. Ecclesiology in the present-day context

There are many factors that shape the way of doing ecclesiology. Historical consciousness brought into forefront by modernity emphasized the developmental character of the church. A positive appreciation of other Christian churches and other religions⁹⁸, i.e. appreciation of God's grace working within them, challenged every image of exclusivity. Consequently, an instant tension between universal, local and particular brought about by globalization paves way for and simultaneously questions inculturation and contextualization. Human suffering on a large scale asks for the "church structured by justice inspired by Jesus' values of the Kingdom of God" and so does the experience and situation of women – for they demand adequate and

⁹⁷ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 4

⁹⁸ "The multiplicity of religions is not an evil which needs to be removed but rather a wealth which is to be welcomed and enjoyed by all." Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 30

credible responses.⁹⁹ Finally the decreasing number of people going to church reshapes understanding of participation more and more into a kind of voluntary association in which membership cannot be forced.¹⁰⁰

According to Haight, all abovementioned factors demand what can be called historical ecclesiology or historically conscious ecclesiology.¹⁰¹ They shape the definition of the object and method of ecclesiology and make one's own standpoint relative. In this line, the starting point for ecclesiology and the basic referent for the word "church" should be the empirical church as a human reality, i.e. the concrete community that exists in history.¹⁰² Secondly, the object of ecclesiology is the universal church or the whole Christian movement, since it makes little sense to limit the object of ecclesiology to one particular tradition.¹⁰³ It would simply restrict the possibility of understanding of all its richness and diversity.

Although having in mind the whole church is for Haight indispensable, at the same time he is aware of the inevitable particularity of one's standpoint. An individual sees the whole church always from the point of view of some particular local church, from his ecclesial settings. One simply cannot entirely escape from viewing it that way as it is not possible to be a member of the whole church. The relationship between local church and whole church is constantly present, since the particular ecclesial standpoint is challenged by the idea of the one Church.¹⁰⁴

Given the divisions of the church in history, there is not a single ecclesiology, and Haight argues that there will never be a single one. "Materially speaking, no single ecclesiology will be able to encompass the whole church."¹⁰⁵ Therefore, one has to conceive a plurality of ecclesiologies at any given time because the different ecclesial realities, historical conditions and contexts determine viewpoints, premises, basic values, and methods of approach to the church.¹⁰⁶

⁹⁹ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 33

¹⁰⁰ The account of factors is not exhaustive and does not claim to be so.

¹⁰¹ Haight uses both terms interchangeably. In the two volumes, he makes a distinction between historical and comparative ecclesiology, with the presupposition that both are historically conscious.

¹⁰² Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 37.

¹⁰³ The reasoning is twofold: (1) by contrast with other religions, Christianity can be perceived as a relatively unified movement; (2) although it is divided into many churches, the church was one in its origins and can be perceived as a historical movement. *Ibid*, p. 40.

¹⁰⁴ The local church cannot be reduced to part or a fragment of the whole church, but rather the whole of what it means to be a church comes to realization in a local church, or in a part of the whole Christian movement. *Ibid*, p. 41.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p. 44.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p. 17.

1.2.1. Method of ecclesiology

Historically conscious ecclesiology focuses on a concrete community in history that has developed and is developing over the time. Although it can be viewed as a social movement and institution, it also understands itself in faith as responding to God's grace.¹⁰⁷ As a consequence, the method of such ecclesiology that aims at comprehensive understanding of the church and also wants to approach present-day people, should necessarily be historical, theological, apologetic and hermeneutical.

Historical

Church is a phenomenon of and in history.¹⁰⁸ Thus, the method for study of the church must take into account that visible church is a this-worldly institution – it is historical and social entity.¹⁰⁹ It has its origins in history and has developed over centuries. In order to understand it, one must trace its development and practice from the beginning till nowadays, and also focus on church as socially constituted.¹¹⁰ In this process, church as a historical institution can and should be studied by social sciences, making use of critical history, sociology, social psychology, anthropology and disciplines concerned with human management.¹¹¹

Theological

However, one cannot speak about church only in terms of a social and historical institution. It is also a theological reality, a gathering of people on the basis of common faith, so the church's self-understanding as having come into existence by the grace of God must be accounted for.¹¹² "The church's relationship to God can be understood as mediated in and through its relationship to the world, history, and society; and the church's relationship to the world can be adequately understood on the basis of its relationship to God."¹¹³

¹⁰⁷ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 44

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 37.

¹⁰⁹ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Systematic Ecclesiology," *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281, p. 269.

¹¹⁰ This leads to an understanding of the church as historically conditioned institution that is changing. Similarly it is possible to perceive the changes in its self-understanding.

¹¹¹ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 60.

¹¹² The relationship to God can be understood in two levels: (1) self-understanding of membership construes church objectively as a gift from God; (2) faith experiences God as Spirit actively present to the church and holding it together. Roger Haight (S.J.), "Systematic Ecclesiology," *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281, p. 270.

¹¹³ Ibid, p. 270.

Apologetic

For Haight, the term *apologetic* signifies a “critically conscious method that seeks to explain, or render intelligible, or to make understandable and comprehensible the beliefs of the community.”¹¹⁴ Therefore, the language used to describe the church cannot be limited to particular group of those who know.¹¹⁵ Especially, if one wishes to communicate with the world that is pluralistic and diverse. Rather, the language should appeal to common human experience.¹¹⁶

Hermeneutical

Finally the method of ecclesiology should be hermeneutical. That means going back to the history of the church and bringing forward the church’s self-understanding by interpretation and appropriation, so that it is relevant in the present.¹¹⁷ The confrontation of the data retrieved from the past with the present-day context always means interpretation that transcends the past understanding. Haight says that “the exigency of truth, then, means that one must affirm what the church is or can be today...”¹¹⁸

1.3. Christian Community in History - a historically conscious ecclesiology

1.3.1. Ecclesiology from above and ecclesiology from below

In order to present the principles of a historically conscious ecclesiology, Haight adopts a broad contrast between what may be called an ecclesiology from above and an ecclesiology from below. This helps him to open up the method of a historically conscious study of the church.¹¹⁹ Both the ecclesiology from above and the ecclesiology from below represent a certain way of (ecclesiological) thinking. They are not two distinct ecclesiologies, but rather two types of ecclesiology, that is, “two abstract forms or constructs that corresponds exactly to no actual ecclesiology”¹²⁰ Consequently, there will probably not be particular ecclesiologists clearly

¹¹⁴ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281, p. 270.

¹¹⁵ Not limiting oneself to the language of one particular church is helpful for advancing in ecumenical dialogues among churches.

¹¹⁶ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 47.

¹¹⁷ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253-281, p. 271.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 272.

¹¹⁹ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 17.

¹²⁰ Roger Haight, (S.J.), Towards an ecclesiology from below, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* »,

representing one or another type, instead, a mixture of characteristics of both approaches can be expected.

Ecclesiology from above

Ecclesiology from above can be characterised by a certain ahistoricity.¹²¹ It tries to grasp the unchangeable, invariant essence or substance of the church in a way that transcends any given context and refuses historical consciousness.¹²² In its understanding, church is doctrinally one, and it is identified with the church generating the ecclesiology, it imagines the universal church in terms of itself.¹²³

Even when the church is not considered constitutive for salvation of all, it is the summit of all religious forms, and the single, normative religion that is superior to all others, because the church is constituted by Christ as its centre.¹²⁴ The church as institution is willed by God - it corresponds to the will of God. It is God who founds the church. In its extreme form ecclesiology from above simply cites scriptural texts as a proof-texts that reflects divine authority.¹²⁵

This method tends to be exclusive, it is so especially by setting forth limits to distinguish the true church from any other erroneous organization, and drawing clear borders around its identity. However, each church develops its own ecclesiology from above, at least in a sense that there is always an ecclesiology from above present in an understanding of the church, although it may not prevail or it may be shared only by a small part of its members.¹²⁶

Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, p. 414.

¹²¹ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 18.

¹²² Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 18.

¹²³ Ibid, p. 20.

¹²⁴ Ibid, p. 23.

¹²⁵ Ibid, p. 22.

¹²⁶ Ibid, p. 19.

Ecclesiology from below

Ecclesiology from below refers to a method that is “concrete, existential and historical.”¹²⁷ By attempting to be responding to the demands of the present-day context, it, first of all, focuses on the empirical organisation or community called church, although it is more than that. This church is also experienced religiously and theologically, because in it and through it people recognise the presence and activity of God.¹²⁸ It seeks to make understandable the faith that is set down in the doctrines while taking into account what the church believes now.

Ecclesiology from below is characterised by a strong sense of historical consciousness and it employs critical historical methods in understanding of how the church developed its most proper characteristics.¹²⁹ It is aware of the developing and changing character of the church in history and tries to show the extent of these changes and their reasons. Simultaneously it takes into account the church’s particularity, since, given the ecclesial diversity, it is simply not possible to think that a single church could carry the full flow of Christian life in a single organisational form.¹³⁰ Ecclesiology from below takes as its object the whole Christian movement and not only one particular tradition.¹³¹

The church exists in the world, not apart from it. Therefore, the categories and thought patterns of secular culture and everyday life become part of the experience, vocabulary and self-understanding of the Christian community. The other side of being within the world brings consciousness about influence of cultural forms to self-understanding of the church.¹³² Since church is perceived as a social-historical reality, the social sciences can be applied in understanding of the church. At the same time ecclesiology from below is aware of the theological dimension i.e. the relation of the church to God.

To summarise, the ecclesiology from above begins with, or argues from authority, and from this position it seeks to justify the form of the church as willed and led by God’s providence.¹³³ By

¹²⁷ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 4.

¹²⁸ Ibid, p. 5.

¹²⁹ Simultaneously we always approach whole Christian movement from historically conditioned perspective of a particular tradition. Ibid, p. 60.

¹³⁰ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, *Comparative ecclesiology*, (New York: Continuum, 2005), p. 7.

¹³¹ With perception of differences between Christianity and other religions, the differences within particular Christian churches seems to be minimal. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 58.

¹³² Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 59.

¹³³ Roger Haight, (S.J.), Towards an ecclesiology from below, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*,

contrast, the ecclesiology from below starts with the experience of a concrete Christian community, and moving from historical and sociological analysis, it wants to arrive at theological understanding of the church.

1.3.2. Principles of historically conscious ecclesiology

Division and structure of Christian Community in History

The two volumes of *Christian community in History* present major events and periods decisive in the development of the church from its origins up to the present-day. The first volume starts from the first Christian communities within Judaism and ends up with the conciliarist movement and the late medieval church. In the second volume starting with Protestant Reformation of sixteenth century, the author changes his 'strategy' and from historical ecclesiology¹³⁴ used in the first volume he moves towards comparative ecclesiology.¹³⁵ It ends up by analyzing the twentieth century and by formulating the challenges for the twenty-first century.

To discern the axioms in the formation of the church, the first volume employs a pattern starting with the historical account of a particular period. After social and theological analysis a scheme follows, in which the church is described in five points: (1) the (organisational) structure; (2) membership of the church; (3) mission of the church; (4) activities; and (5) relation of the church to the world. Finally, rooted in this analysis, the author formulates principles for a historical ecclesiology. In the second volume, Haight selects representative authors from particular traditions and according to a similar scheme presents their main ideas. To minimize the risk of distorting a particular author, he first introduces the historical period with its challenges and also the context in which the text emerged.

(Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, p. 416.

¹³⁴ Historical ecclesiology uses history to capture and stress the particularity of the church in each period. It uses sociological imagination and sociological models of organisation to help appreciate the elements and dynamics of organised church. Simultaneously it integrates the theological self-understanding that constitutes the community within historical reality so that the two dimensions interpret each other: the historical imperfectly actualizes the theological ideal, and the theological keeps calling for adjustments in the actual church. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 2.

¹³⁵ From the sixteenth century ecclesiology becomes a central concern of theology and churches were systematically portraying their nature, organisational structure, and mission. Since a plurality of churches developed, the only way to understand the whole church is by a comparative ecclesiology. This consists in analyzing and portraying in an organised or systematic way two or more different ecclesiologies so that they can be compared. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 4. This is not done to stress the differences among ecclesiologies, but rather after having displayed them in their differences, to see each one as part of the one tradition of the whole church. Ibid, p. 6.

In the two volumes of *Christian Community in History* it is possible to identify three broad general lines of thought that are characteristic of Haight's approach. The first one can be described with a tensional pair "unity and plurality". It deals with the changed understanding of unity as opposed to uniformity, and provides space for accepting certain diversity or pluralism – as its salient characteristic. The second can be termed as the communitarian grounding of authority and ministry, which are perceived as a function of the community. The principle of functionality "refers to the way ministries were adopted in the church to meet the needs of the community" and is to be extended into other areas.¹³⁶ Finally, pneumatocentrism is the key term for the third line of Haight's approach. God as Spirit at work in the church is one of the theological foundations of church and of ecclesiology and will be very much stressed in an ecclesiology from below.

Unity and plurality

The church was one in its origin, and from the very beginning, unity was perceived as a need and an important value. It applied to the local community, regional church and less strongly to the whole Christian movement. After the many divisions that happened in following centuries, the issue of unity was again brought into the forefront by the contrast experience of two world wars and serious compromises on the mission caused by divisions among the churches.

However, the point was reached when there could not be a united Christendom if unity be defined as uniformity without self-conscious respect for differences.¹³⁷ According to Haight, the new understanding of Christian unity in a pluralistic way must include and preserve the life-giving traditions and denominational identities.¹³⁸ At the same time, this acknowledgment cannot lead to satisfaction with current divisions and must avoid the understanding of the church's unity purely eschatologically. Unity must be conceived as a concrete and urgent task.

Church is in constant interaction with its historical environment – it is living in the world. The appropriation of God's revelation must include adjustments for the present historical situation as well as endeavours to remain as much faithful as possible to the New Testament church, which should serve as a reference point.¹³⁹ The concept of pluralism acknowledges that different

¹³⁶ Roger Haight, (S.J.), Towards an ecclesiology from below, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, p. 434.

¹³⁷ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 212.

¹³⁸ Ibid, p. 494.

¹³⁹ However, the normativity of New Testament church should be seen more in the logic of church's early development, in pragmatic fluidity and a responsiveness to rapidly changing conditions. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 61.

churches will in the course of history respond differently to this task. Similarly, the relationships of the church to the world, state and society will take different forms.

Unity is for Haight an important value, however, it is inherently considered together with pluralism - they constitute a pair that is in a constant tension. Cyprian of Cartago with his ability to affirm unity across considerable differences among local churches is presented as an example.¹⁴⁰ Consequently, differences in the church structures, and cultural forms are not insurmountable or fundamental and there exists certain degree of legitimate diversity. Even, if there are divisions of visible church, these “cannot eclipse the theological dimension of unity, where church is one in its faith in God mediated by Jesus.”¹⁴¹

Communitarian grounding of authority and ministry

In an ecclesiology from below, developments of the church are viewed historically and functionally. It involves historical reconstruction, a broad sense of historicity and a critical appreciation of historical sources. The church structures emerge within the framework of a religious community, and are understood in organic terms of growth and development. They are created to respond to inner needs of the community and environmental demands – they function for the well-being of the community. The principle of functionality does not only describe how the structures and ministries emerged, but also provides a criterion for changes or for creation of new structures and new ministries. Therefore, the source of authority is to be located in the community itself, i.e. in the community of all believers.

Since church is one reality with both theological and social-historical dimensions, responding to the needs of community cannot prevent one from speaking about inspiration by God as Spirit to introduce new ideas. The relationship of the community to God enables one to identify the sources of ministry in the actuality of the community at any given time.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ According to Cyprian, the local church could only be one, however there was a strong sense of responsibility for unity of the whole. He could pragmatically affirm communion across differences – though “sacramental theology and practice were serious issues, because very much was at stake in them.” Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 192.

¹⁴¹ Roger Haight (S.J.), “On Systematic Ecclesiology,” *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, Fall (1992): 220-238, p. 230.

The insight of unity is emphasized by communion ecclesiology of orthodox churches. Church units are held primarily together by a unity of faith through communication, and where communion is established from basic eucharistic communities up to communions of communions. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 488 This image has of course limits, and should be conceived within the context of Orthodox churches, where his value is inspiring.

¹⁴² Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 63.

As an example, the development of papal office can be functionally and theologically seen as guided by Spirit inspired need to safeguard unity. In the same way, though, the Spirit can inspire different arrangements of the church structures.

Pneumatocentrism

Locating the authority in the church within the community of believers rests on the presupposition that God as Spirit is present in their midst. Actually, the logic of ecclesiology from below calls for pneumatocentrism.¹⁴³ God's experience is then more spontaneously expressed by the symbol of God as Spirit, who accompanies, animates and guides the church.¹⁴⁴ Pneumatocentric approach emphasizes Jesus more as a historical source, head of the tradition or the Jesus movement, out of which the church emerged.

Ecclesiology (from above) focused on christocentrism would highlight more the faithfulness to the tradition handed over through the centuries and would be cautious about any changes. Ecclesiology from below, by contrast, calls for a creative interpretation and appropriation of tradition, since living in the changing world brings ever new challenges that need to be credibly responded to. The idea in the background states that it is not possible to remain faithful, without being creative.

Pneumatocentric approach in fact encourages inculturation, a certain particularity and specificity and allows also for different expressions of faith. In the light of contemporary knowledge, dogmas, creeds and confessions were subjects of constant reinterpretation. Therefore, differences of doctrinal formulations are not necessarily a stumbling block, but rather an expression of the richness of faith.

Consequently, it is possible to see the Spirit at work in any particular church. The differences are not seen as a final goal, but are diverse expressions of communities existing in diverse environments and genuinely searching God. Accepting differences within unity is an expression of trust that God as Spirit is at work in the particular church. Simultaneously, Haight accentuates that: "God as Spirit is recognised as the animating principle of the church, but it is not an objective principle and cannot be appealed to as a justification for the various historical decisions and routes the church has chosen."¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ The Spirit language then suggests more the work of God within the community, and less an external power operating on the community. Ibid, p. 53.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 62.

¹⁴⁵ Roger Haight, (S.J.), Towards an ecclesiology from below, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, p. 431.

1.4. Conclusion

The work *Christian Community in History* “aims at establishing the suppositions for a constructive analysis of the church in a theological language closely aligned to historical experience and thus more comprehensible to both insiders and outsiders.”¹⁴⁶ The principles obtained by method of ecclesiology from below provide the basis for a critical appreciation of the developments of the church and bring into the forefront three general issues.

The ongoing tension between unity and plurality creates and demands space for accepting a certain deal of diversity. Pluralism within the great church then inevitably entails a different idea of unity – redefined in a way that excludes any uniformity. On the other hand, unity is more and more perceived as an important value, as is exemplified by the ecumenical movement. The communitarian grounding of authority and ministry critically challenges every institution of the church. It asks to define the crucial values of the concrete church or community and requires functional adjustments to these values. The theological principle, acknowledging God as Spirit at work within the community as one who accompanies, guides and animates, allows for freedom and creativity in the community. It considers inculturation as indispensable and entails a great deal of pluralism that is legitimate.

All three issues raise an important question of the limits. What is the acceptable degree of pluralism? Where does the functional approach end? What can be claimed to be inspired by the Spirit? Haight is certainly aware of them and he suggests some guidelines. For example, functional approach and adjustments in new conditions are constrained by fidelity to the past. The tradition should be contextually appropriated in the constant dialogue with the ideals of New Testament church. Similarly, it is important that “the Spirit-centred understanding of the church does not cut the experience of God as Spirit off from Jesus Christ. In the Christian imagination, there is no experience of God as Spirit independently of Jesus of Nazareth who is the Christ” – this Christian experience is christomorphic: the memory of Jesus controls the Spirit.¹⁴⁷ To conclude, Haight’s principles explicitly demand ecclesial discernment – that is discernment of the church as an existential, concrete and historical community of believers - in order to identify what is the core and mission of the church in hope and faith that in this process, it is guided by Spirit.

¹⁴⁶ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 14.

¹⁴⁷ Roger Haight, (S.J.), Towards an ecclesiology from below, In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont*, (Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000): 413-436, p. 433.

2. CRITIQUE OF CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY

2.1. Introduction

The second chapter will summarise the critique that was addressed to *Christian Community in History*. Apart from book reviews, it will mainly draw upon the Review Symposium published in *Horizons*. It offers perspectives of four theologians – two men and two women coming from different denominational backgrounds: Susan K. Wood, Amy Plantinga Pauw, Richard P. McBrien and Francis A. Sullivan SJ.

The focus will be on three topics of critique. The first concerns the method of his work, namely ecclesiology from below and aims at clarification of its approach to the church. The second is focused on essential elements of church and seeks to discover the limits of the church, which is important in discussions about the divisions of the church. The last topic covers the relation between unity and diversity and seeks to answer questions about the centre of unity. What is Haight's answer to posed challenges? Does ecclesiology from below do justice to Christian doctrines? How can an authentic church be defined? Is there any unifying centre possible in the approach from below?

There are also some limitations of this chapter that need to be acknowledged at the beginning. Firstly, there will be no immersion into discussions about Haight's accuracy of historical analysis, or choices of particular authors in drawing principles of a historically conscious ecclesiology, since these would exceed the scope of this essay. The second limitation consists in Haight's work as such. He intended to write "a parallel constructive or systematic ecclesiology of the church" [similar to *Jesus Symbol of God*], but he "could not do so without working through the history of ecclesiology".¹⁴⁸ *Christian Community in History* wants to be precisely this work in the history of ecclesiology. As such, it is descriptive rather than prescriptive. It should serve as a *propaedeutic* to a constructive or systematic ecclesiology. The first two volumes can be understood as the first part of a two part ecclesiology from below, which will be followed by a more systematic and constructive essay.¹⁴⁹

Therefore the goal I have set for what I have tentatively entitled *Ecclesial Existence* is to consider norms and mediate differences in the construction of common ecclesiology modelled by the World Council of Church's Baptism,

¹⁴⁸ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Author's response," *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397, p. 387.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 389.

Eucharist, and Ministry. My hope is that this will provide a “fitting conclusion” to *Christian Community in History* by being “a more fully developed constructive ecclesiology that appeals to the threads of the tradition of the church which are held in common, is schooled in the principles and axioms of historical and comparative ecclesiology, and is build on the common faith in Jesus the Christ and God as Spirit”.¹⁵⁰

Given these limitations, there are issues that cannot be addressed with certainty and either are to be deduced from the nature of the two existing volumes and from his other writings, or just passed over in silence until next volume is published. One of them, for example, is the issue of unity and diversity of the church. As Rudy writes, “the lack of a constructive proposal, either as a more substantial conclusion or as a third volume, leaves one hanging, waiting to see a more explicit, systematic account of Haight's vision of contemporary ecclesiology.”¹⁵¹

2.2. Ecclesiology from below— a discussion on the method

The two volumes consist in charting of the changes and continuities that mark the history of the church. The resulting principles for reflection upon the church are derived from and relate to historical events.¹⁵² They are retrieved upon following three criteria - fidelity to the past, intelligibility and coherence today and empowerment into the future.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, the selection raises further questions.

Who is going to decide to what past the fidelity is owed and what constitutes the principle of intelligibility and coherence today? Wood poses precisely this question and is interested into the connection between the Christian community and its doctrines. According to her, Haight’s ecclesiology from below “never quite correlates with doctrinal claims, what he would call ecclesiology from above”.¹⁵⁴ She claims that doctrine is inseparable from Christian community for the church is a post-paschal assembly gathered by faith in the risen Christ and doctrines are expressions of that faith.

¹⁵⁰ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Author's response”, p. 389.

¹⁵¹ Christopher Ruddy, “The Boundaries, Please,” *America*, vol. 193, Issue 3 (8/1/2005): 22-25, p 25.

¹⁵² Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386, p. 375.

¹⁵³ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 55.

¹⁵⁴ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” p. 376. Moreover, Haight claims that “existential community in Christ holds priority over doctrinal agreements.” Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 422.

2.2.1. The community of faithful and the doctrines

Wood's question seems to suggest a separation in an ecclesiology from below between the community of faithful and the doctrines or hierarchy and she has an impression that it somehow goes against the doctrinal claims. On the one hand, Haight would certainly agree that these two are inseparable, and on the other hand, the perceived division is not accurate to the nature of his work. He does not aim at undermining the hierarchical church or challenging the doctrines. Rather, he suggests to view the doctrines as stemming from the community or as an expression of the community, which in their mutual relation has to be remembered. In other words, one could say that doctrines are the function of community of believers and are thus intrinsically bound to it. If the ecclesiology from below refuses or challenges the doctrinal claims, it would be because of their ahistorical interpretation.

Similarly, the use of the sociological-historical language to address the church and its institutions does not necessarily avoid correlation with their doctrinal claims. Although it could seem more proper to speak about them in theological language, it is necessary to bear in mind that they are always interpreted - simply by the fact that they are used in another historical context different from their context of origin.¹⁵⁵ The interpretation is therefore more properly approached by sociological-historical language. The use of these two languages enables to speak more realistically about the church and could be perceived as a loose functional analogy to Augustine's distinction between visible and invisible church, or similar distinctions made in history.¹⁵⁶ For Haight, revelation occurs in human subjectivity and becomes conscious in a reflecting and responding faith and an affirming belief.¹⁵⁷ In his opinion, the theological and sociological-historical language seems to be inherently connected in the community.

To summarise, the ecclesiology from below refers rather to the point of departure – and the key word is *from*.¹⁵⁸ Thus, one starts at the level of community, looks on its historical developments

¹⁵⁵ Haight is aware that the doctrines need to be appropriated to be relevant for our age. It is not possible to simply use the doctrinal language, for example, of the historical period of the Council of Trent, since it can be easily misunderstood and would have no significant bearing on present-day realities.

¹⁵⁶ According to Augustine, within the outer church subsisted an invisible church consisting of sanctified elect and known only to God. In the Reformation the distinction took a different meaning, the invisible church designates the same people, but the point is to identify them as a true church precisely as differentiated from the empirical church in its institutional structure. In the Anglican church, the invisible church is the true church not as the inner substance of the empirical church, but in some cases despite it. All these distinctions wanted to address realistically the church earthly dimension with its mistakes but simultaneously as a divine reality. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol.2, p. 213.

¹⁵⁷ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Author's response", p. 390.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p. 391.

and tries to discern God as Spirit at work.¹⁵⁹ The Christian community - an object of interpretation, “is the result of revelation, but interpretation of it consist in human reflection, however animated and inspired it may be in its background faith.”¹⁶⁰ The relation to God always provides a corrective and inspires critique of social and historical conditions of the church, and on the other hand, social and historical critique informs theology.

2.3. *Essential elements in the church – authentic church*

A second group of objections deals with the essential elements of the church, which is a major question “for ecclesiology that tries to reach out and encompass the whole church”.¹⁶¹ Which institutions are considered to be normative? Which are to be seen as essential for an authentic church? Are there any of these structures or institutions that are essential to a fully authentic church and are in their current form church dividing? Is there any of them, asks Sullivan, “whose rejection would be qualified as one of those ‘gravest reasons’ that could justify the separation between churches?”¹⁶²

Taking the issue of episcopacy as an example, is it necessary to understand it as a church dividing issue – which is the case for Roman Catholic, or Orthodox churches? Or are there some other ways to think about it? Haight, although he recognises it as an “essential and divinely willed structure” –simultaneously adds that it does not justify it as church-dividing.¹⁶³ Instead, he suggests to consider whether particular institutions fulfils its function and whether it serves the good of the community – he lays down the priority of the community of believers and the presence of God as Spirit in their midst.

His approach can be schematically exemplified in a series of propositions accentuating the role of God as Spirit:¹⁶⁴ (1) the Spirit was at work in the origins of the church urging the formation of structures that would maintain in the history the well-being of the church; (2) the structures emerged as a function of human freedom, but not without an impulse of God as Spirit; (3) what was impelled by the Spirit at any given time may or may not be an essential element for a time, so that at another time Spirit may urge a reformation or a deliberate neglect or a dismantling of a

¹⁵⁹ The theological language is implied in the ecclesiology from below simply because of the nature of the object in question.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 391.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, p. 391.

¹⁶² Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” p. 379.

¹⁶³ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 194.

¹⁶⁴ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Author's response”, p. 392.

given institution or structure. In an ecclesiology from below, the approach to essential elements of the church opens the question up for ecumenical discussion.¹⁶⁵

2.4. *Unity and diversity*

In *Christian Community in History*, Haight “paints a striking image of diversity in the church over time.”¹⁶⁶ His work has not as its goal some form of Christian unity, but rather it makes it apparent by contrast with “the pluralism of religions in the middle of which all of us exist.”¹⁶⁷ When comparing Christianity with other religions, it can stand out as a relatively unified movement. What would then be a positive definition of Christian Community? What constitutes the basis for the unity and where does it have its limits? Is it possible to identify a unifying centre, as Wood asks, around which to conceive the diversity in some reasonable limits, or in other words, where the centre of communion is located?¹⁶⁸

In fact, Haight does not state explicitly any ecumenical principle in his work, and with his method there is no conclusion in the sense of an unifying centre to be drawn. The present two volumes serve more as a description of a church in the approach from below, and want to prepare the ground for more constructive approach that will seek “to consider norms and mediate differences in the construction of common ecclesiology.”¹⁶⁹ Therefore it would be premature to draw conclusions on an unifying principle. Nevertheless, there are some allusions that illuminate the idea of unity or common ground of Christian churches and some conclusion are also implied by the method from below.

2.4.1. **Shared field of meaning or behaviour**

First of all, Haight’s idea of unity is closely connected with *pluralism*, which here is employed to mean “unity in diversity or differences within a shared field of meaning or behaviour.”¹⁷⁰ It entails a space for diverse expression of faith and a space for different arrangements of church’s

¹⁶⁵ In the case of episcopacy, for example, “a common comparative ecclesiology may even recommend episcopacy as a universally relevant structure, as does *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, for example (BEM, ‘Ministry,’ 25). But it does not suggest a simple yes or no response to the question...” Ibid, p. 393.

¹⁶⁶ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” p. 376.

¹⁶⁷ Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 1, p. 9.

¹⁶⁸ “The challenge is to identify the unifying centre. Historical reconstruction alone cannot supply this.” Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” p. 376.

¹⁶⁹ Roger Haight (S.J.), “Author’s response”, p. 389.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 394.

organisation. However, there has to be some shared common ground on the basis of which the diversities are to be lived, and Haight suggests using the World Council of Churches' *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* as a model (BEM).¹⁷¹

Secondly, in the BEM, two important aspects come into forefront. On the one hand "the development of WCC required considerable self-transcendence and trust in God as Spirit at work in the church at large on the part of member churches; it also entailed open reliance on a common faith and on the other churches."¹⁷² On the other hand, the authority of BEM rests *de facto* in the measure that several churches recognised it and it is based upon their willingness to have a dialogue together.

Thirdly, the method of ecclesiology from below places limitations and requirements on the models of church unity. Certainly, it is not possible to speak about centre-periphery models of unity. Rather, it supports the idea of non-hierarchical fellowship, where the churches' traditions are positively appreciated. Haight suggests exploring the "deliberately vague phrase 'communion ecclesiology' that opens up a creative imagination for ecclesiology in our time."¹⁷³

The ecclesiology from below welcomes ecclesial pluralism and inculturation and in fact sees the church as pluralistic from the very beginning. Pauw, however, points at the limits of this approach, and criticises Haight from the other side. In spite of the cultural pluralism that is embraced in Catholic church and can be appreciated, she says that the internal and institutional fractures are by the majority of the world's Christians hardly felt as non-toxic and positive.¹⁷⁴ Similarly, the inculturation that lacks a critical engagement with historical tradition results in an "ahistoricism and absolutism in a new guise".¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ Roger Haight (S.J.), "Author's response", p. 389.

¹⁷² Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 424.

¹⁷³ Ibid, p. 424 It would also be interesting to look at the question of unity from the perspective of ecofeminist theology. Ecofeminist model would emphasize community, solidarity, interconnectedness and fellowship. See Mary J. Ress, *Ecofeminist theology* (New York: Orbis Books, 2006).

¹⁷⁴ Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., "Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives," p. 381.

¹⁷⁵ According to Pauw, inculturation and ahistoricism are not necessarily incompatible. As an example she states "entrepreneurial, individualistic ethos of nondenominational American Protestantism." Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., "Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives," p. 381 Her critique is interesting also from another point of view. While refusing episcopacy and papacy in their present forms and considering them as church dividing, she expresses the need for a firm ecclesial standing or a structure (to be able to be open towards other churches) and a critical engagement with historical tradition – that would be more emphasized in a catholic point of view. Implicitly, she points at particular issues important for the unity of the church and at the possibility of appreciating certain institutions across denominations.

The whole idea of unity is constructed theologically as unity of faith¹⁷⁶ – expressed in diverse ways, and ecclesialogically in recognition and mutual appreciation of particular churches.¹⁷⁷ Thus, it is possible to overcome the borders among churches, which are challenged to the extent in which they exclude the other. As a consequence, the denominational identity is to be redefined in a non-competitive way. Haight thus encourages finding new ways to live in our identity as a body with many members.

2.5. Conclusion

Wood characterised the method from below with the words: “an apologetic for functionalism and pluralism appears to be a subtext for this work...”¹⁷⁸ While this is certainly one aspect of *Christian Community in History*, it is not the only one. The ecclesiology from below refers rather to point of departure. Thus, the life, organization and doctrines of the church are judged in their relation to the community of believers. At the same time, there is a strong sense of God as Spirit at work that inspires different arrangements of the church, while the history and tradition are seriously taken into account. The unity of the church is defined as a space for diversity within a shared field of meaning or behaviour. Theologically, it is conceived as unity of faith expressed in many diverse ways.

In an ecclesiology from below, there is no space for simple yes or no answers, rather, the responses to questions are retrieved in a process of ecumenical discussion. What was brought about in history may or may not be an essential element for all the time, and ecclesiology from below allows for rearrangements of once established institutions.

¹⁷⁶ The goal is not a unity of a single church, but the unity of faith to which many churches, were to give common witness. Roger Haight S.J., *Christian Community in History*, vol. 2, p. 492.

¹⁷⁷ Pauw speaks about a sacramentality of the church that comes simply from this kind of hermeneutic of generosity towards other believers. Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P., “Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives,” p. 383.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 375.

3. PNEUMATOCENTRISM AND LITURGICAL ECCLESIOLOGY

3.1. *Introduction*

Pneumatocentrism tends to emphasize pluralism and diversity, unity then demands a common basis. Where can there be found the fine balance between unity and diversity and is it possible to delineate the borders? In the last chapter, two issues will be examined - (1) the role of pneumatocentrism in an ecclesiology from below and its limits; and (2) basis of unity among Christians. The main aim of this chapter is to find and briefly illustrate other approaches that can contribute to Haight's ecclesiology from below.

The complexity of the issue of pneumatocentrism in ecclesiology can be seen on the background of ongoing tensions between Christology and Pneumatology, which have in the history of the Church been understood in different ways by all Christian traditions.¹⁷⁹ The role of God as Spirit in Haight's work is of fundamental importance and it is a necessary presupposition of bringing forward the answers to the question of unity and pluralism. The process in which the answers are to be found can be described as "*ecclesial discernment*"- a way of dealing with questions encountered in the life of the church.

By using liturgical ecclesiology, I will explore another ecclesiological approach and will try to reflect on Christian unity from a liturgical point of view. The advantage of this approach is its primary theological focus on the concrete community of believers and a possibility of grounding the unity on everyday practice in a worshipping assembly.

3.2. *God as Spirit in the Church – addressing the limits*

The basic idea in the background of *Christian Community in History* is the presence and constant activity of God as Spirit in the midst of the community from its beginning. He guides it, moves it and animates it. This statement of faith probably raises so many questions as it seeks to answer. How to recognise this presence of the Spirit in the church? What are the signs of his presence in the activities of the church? Finally, what consequences can we draw out of this

¹⁷⁹ The different solutions to this question have far reaching consequences for theology as can be seen for example in the history of the East - West relations but as well in basic liturgical practices. "It is well known that in Syria and Palestine confirmation preceded baptism liturgically... Given the fact that confirmation was normally regarded as the rite of the 'giving of the Spirit,' one could argue that in cases where confirmation preceded baptism we had a priority of Pneumatology over Christology." Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997, p. 127.

statement?

According to Irenaeus, the church and the Spirit condition each other at two different but interdependent points of entry. “Where the Spirit is, there is also the Church, but also that where the Church is there is also the Spirit.”¹⁸⁰ Simultaneously, the affirmation “I believe in the Holy Spirit” is a part of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which was formulated in the fourth century at an ecumenical council. At the same time, this belief is connected to the church, since it is belief not only in the Spirit, but in himself who “makes the Church one, holy, catholic and apostolic – Spirit is actively present and effects these graces through God’s mysterious design”.¹⁸¹

Emphasis on the Spirit acting within the community grants freedom to its life and tends to appreciate the local reality. It can value specific diverse arrangements according to local conditions, needs and challenges. Based on the trust of the working of the Spirit, the diversity is possible among local communities, it can be accepted and appreciated, but at the same time mutual trust allows for the unity among them.¹⁸² Congar says that the Spirit does not bring about unity by using pressure or by reducing the whole of the church’s life to a uniform pattern. He does it by the more delicate way of communion.¹⁸³

Similar accents on the role of the Spirit in the Church can be found in the work of the orthodox theologian John D. Zizioulas. In his book *Being as Communion* Zizioulas examines the relation between Pneumatology and Christology¹⁸⁴ and brings into the forefront important implications for ecclesiology, namely eschatological approach, emphasis on community and iconic character of ecclesial institutions that have their parallel in Haight’s thought.

For Zizioulas, the main contribution of the Spirit is that he brings an eschatological aspect into Christology. If the particularity of the Son is becoming the history, then the Spirit liberates the Son from the bondage of history. The Spirit is the *beyond* history, he brings into history the last

¹⁸⁰ Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol 1, (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983): p. 68

¹⁸¹ Michael A. Fahey, “Church.” In Francis Schüssler Fiorenza & John P. Galvin (eds.), *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1992): p. 43.

¹⁸² The interplay between sameness and difference has its pattern in a prior way in the triune God and draws on the theology of the Trinity. Stanley J. Grenz, "The Social God and the Relational Self: Toward a Theology of the Imago Dei in the Postmodern Context" *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 24 (2002): 33-57, p. 53.

¹⁸³ Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, p. 17.

¹⁸⁴ The important question of *Being as Communion* is how to bring Pneumatology and Christology into a full and organic synthesis. Zizioulas asserts that both Western and Orthodox theology have not done much justice to the role of Pneumatology in ecclesiology. “It becomes clear that Orthodox theology needs to work closely together with Western theology if it is to be really helpful to itself and to others.” Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, p. 126.

days, the eschaton.¹⁸⁵ The consequence of the eschatological approach in the ecclesiology is the liberation of the ecclesiology from the historical perspective.¹⁸⁶ This implies more complex notions of the church, its unity and apostolicity that alongside the tradition handed over through the centuries encompass the critical element of the coming Kingdom of God. It brings as well certain freedom into the understanding of the ecclesial institutions.

According to Haight, the ecclesial institutions are grounded in the community. Thus he starts at the community and arrives at the institutions, which are understood as functions of the community. The necessary condition is the inspiration and the presence of the God as Spirit, and then the institutions are judged in relation to the wellbeing of the community. On the contrary, Zizioulas sees the ecclesial institutions as iconic, as reflections of the Kingdom.¹⁸⁷ That means their ontology does not lie in the institutions themselves, but in their relation to God or Christ.¹⁸⁸ The conditioning of the ecclesial institutions is eschatological. This gives them sacramental and epicletical character, that is, they depend for their efficacy on the prayer of the community.¹⁸⁹ Zizioulas has a very similar understanding of the community in relation to ecclesial institutions, which are made to a certain extent relative, but he has a different starting point and uses a different reasoning.¹⁹⁰

There are some limits to the experience of the Spirit, because not all ecclesial arrangements and deeds of the church can be justified on the basis of pneumatocentrism. Firstly, the experience of God as Spirit can not be disconnected from that of Jesus Christ.¹⁹¹ Congar claims that there is “a unity between the activity of the Spirit and that of the glorified Christ, since ‘the Lord is the

¹⁸⁵ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, p. 130.

¹⁸⁶ It does not mean that it cuts ecclesiology from its historical perspective, which is very clear in Zizioulas’ work.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid p. 138.

¹⁸⁸ There are, Zizioulas says, ministries that serve temporal historical needs, but these cannot claim ecclesial status in a fundamental structural sense. He adds that “history is never a sufficient justification for the existence of a certain ecclesial institution, be it with reference to tradition, apostolic succession, scriptural foundation or actual historical needs.” Ibid p. 138.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid p. 138.

¹⁹⁰ The difference with Haight is mainly in accents on the role of the Spirit in the church. In Haight’s ecclesiology, Spirit accompanies, animates and guides the church. Institutions are then seen more functionally compared with Zizioulas’ theology, where the Spirit makes the Church be and where the institutions have a “radically” eschatological conditioning.

¹⁹¹ Congar writes that he used to make a radical distinction between the institutions as derived from Christ (as apostolate and means of grace of which Jesus had established the principles and which were accompanied by the activity of the Spirit) and free intervention of the Spirit (as a kind of free sector in which the Spirit alone was active). Although he refused this distinction later on, he still insists on the existence of that free sector. Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, p. 12.

Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.”¹⁹² This line of argument is emphasized also in *Christian Community in History*.

Second limit of the Spirit experience can be described in terms of apostolicity – a continuity or a communion in essentials with the original witnessing of the first-century apostles – the entire apostolic community of believers in the first generation.¹⁹³ For Congar, the Spirit is the principle of that communion, and therefore his inspiration in the church has to be discerned in dialogue with tradition and also a well-being of the church.¹⁹⁴ Moreover, the apostolicity is understood universally and cannot be limited just to the episcopal succession.

The universal apostolicity is fundamentally an apostolicity of faith, but it is also an apostolicity of service, witness, suffering and struggle. The ‘apostolic succession’, in the technical use of this term, has to be placed within the context of this apostolicity, that is, of communion extended in time. It is, after all, possible to speak of an apostolic succession in the case of all believers, but only in the wider context of the faithful transmission of faith.¹⁹⁵

For Zizioulas, apostolicity is understood both eschatologically and historically. In one approach, apostolicity means a retrospective continuity with the past and in the other one it comes from the side of future as an anticipation of final nature of the Church.¹⁹⁶ Church is apostolic in the first case, if it faithfully transmits the apostolic kerygma; in the second case, if it applies the apostolic kerygma to a particular historical context and then judges this context in a prophetic way through the vision of eschata.¹⁹⁷

3.2.1. Ecclesial discernment

Emphasis on pneumatocentrism establishes presuppositions for diversity among churches. However, it does not set any limits of diversity, for these have to be found in a process of dialogue, which is brought into forefront in the idea of ecclesial discernment. Pneumatocentrism and ecclesial discernment are closely connected, in a sense that the discernment presupposes God as Spirit acting within the community. Nowadays, when absolute norms and universal narratives are seriously undermined, and when the particularity and local reality is much more

¹⁹² Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, p. 12.

¹⁹³ Michael A. Fahey, “Church”, p. 43.

¹⁹⁴ “Each is given manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.” Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, p. 45.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 45.

¹⁹⁶ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, p. 178.

¹⁹⁷ Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*, p. 181.

appreciated, discernment provides a way of decision-making that is sensitive to both the local reality and to the members of discerning community. Haight's ecclesiology from below calls for discernment since, by its nature, it refuses to offer any absolute answers. Rather the answers are to be found in the process of an dialogue.

The ecclesial discernment draws on the presence of God as Spirit is in the midst of the community¹⁹⁸ and stands for a process of decision-making that seeks to find a way of being most responsive to God in given circumstances. Discernment is not the same as finding the uniquely correct answer, nor does it claim to do so. Rather it is a method and it aims to find an answer that is appropriate to the challenges it seeks to address. The adjective "ecclesial" then refers to the community, where the discernment is taking place and which sets the limits to taken decisions.

In the process of discernment, the idea of the whole church needs to be emphasized. The whole community of believers (i.e. all local churches) is the parts of the Body of Christ; through their faith, they are in Christ and thus the Spirit is present in their midst.¹⁹⁹ David S. Cunningham, when commenting on the Reformation-era says:

*"But it was precisely this point that the Reformation-era disputants refused to accept; and so, in their loud condemnations of one another, they did not understand themselves to be dismembering the Body of Christ. Rather, they were seeking the surgical removal of a cancerous growth and a restoration of that Body to health."*²⁰⁰

This example points at the danger of discernment and at the need to see the discerning community as a part of the whole church.²⁰¹ Good intentions are in itself not a guaranty of good results, but rather the framework of the whole community, a sense of intrinsic co-belonging and

¹⁹⁸ Congar then also quotes Hippolytus' words preceding some decision-making: "Let us hasten to the assembly, where the Spirit produces rich fruit". Yves Congar (O.P.), *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol 1, p. 68.

¹⁹⁹ Stanley J. Grenz, "The Social God and the Relational Self: Toward a Theology of the Imago Dei in the Postmodern Context", *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 24 (2002): 33-57, p. 56.

²⁰⁰ David S. Cunningham, "A Response to Ephraim Radner's The End of the Church: A Pneumatology of Christian Division in the West," *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 83, Issue 1, (Winter 2001): p89.

²⁰¹ The Faith and Order study on Ecclesiology, *The Nature and Mission of the Church - A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement* deals with the discernment under the section "Oversight". Personal, communal and collegial aspect is mentioned. Simultaneously, these aspects "refer not only to particular structures and processes, but also describe the informal reality of the bonds of koinonia, the mutual belonging and accountability within the ongoing common life of the church." *The Nature and Mission of the Church - A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement*. Faith and Order Paper no. 198, Geneva, World Council of Churches, 2005, p. 25.

awareness that decisions taken in the local church influences the whole.²⁰²

3.3. Liturgical point of view

Haight offers a view on the church that is pluralistic and diverse. The method from below and principles for historical ecclesiology show that plurality belonged to the church from its very beginning and that the diverse developments that followed can be seen as enriching, can be appreciated, although not presented as a final goal. However, he does not yet fully address the basis on which to ground the Christian unity. This answer can be yielded by liturgical approach, which shares some commonalities with ecclesiology from below.

A church, that is a Christian community, as it is understood by the liturgical theology and consequently by the liturgical ecclesiology, is an assembly gathered for worship, it is a concrete meeting-for-worship.²⁰³ A church has in the first place a concrete, local accessible meaning.²⁰⁴ The gathered people constitute a community of Christians, “people of God” – they are the human social reality that follows from faith in Christ.²⁰⁵ The faith in God that Christian theology seeks to elucidate is the faith of the church and faith in the church. In liturgical approach, it is understood as the faith that is held together with other people, and that is primarily coming to expression in an assembly gathered for worship.²⁰⁶

3.3.1. Understanding of an assembly

Assembly cannot be understood as any gathering of people. It is not a concert or a group of people coming for a lecture. Rather, it is “a gathering of persons in which each of those gathered

²⁰² A good example of ecclesial discernment can be found in the Churches of Anglican Communion (CAC), and their recent discussion on homosexuality. The decision by the 74th General Convention of the Episcopal Church (USA) to give consent to the election of bishop Gene Robinson to the Diocese of New Hampshire, the authorising by a diocese of the Anglican Church of Canada of a public Rite of Blessing for same sex unions and the involvement in other provinces by bishops without the consent or approval of the incumbent bishop to perform episcopal functions have raised serious dissent throughout the Anglican Communion and have threatened its unity. *The Windsor Report 2004* describes the way in which the CAC dealt with this crisis by way of respectful listening and collective decision. For more information, see <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/> (consulted 26.6.2007).

²⁰³ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999, p. 5.

²⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 43.

²⁰⁵ Ibid, p. 5.

²⁰⁶ Sources of liturgical ecclesiology are then the activities of the assemblies themselves – “Eucharist of the church, the thanksgiving for all things at the meal of Trinitarian faith; the table of Jesus Christ, which welcomes outsiders and sinners; real food of this world that becomes the presence of Christ’s body and blood in the power of the Spirit so that “the many” eat and drink before the face of God now in this world; the universal banquet which is astonishingly personal.” Ibid, p. 15.

has a participatory role, in which the central matters of worship are at the heart of this shared participation.²⁰⁷ In order to understand what a liturgical assembly is, it is important to see what is the assembly gathered for, and what the gathered people believed they should do at their meetings. “The Christians, the *ekklesia* met to gather around the same thing the ancient biblical assemblies had at their heart: the presence of the Word of God.”²⁰⁸ It is an assembly centred around Scripture reading and preaching, Baptism and the bread and cup of Eucharist. According to Lathrop, we can experience an assembly as a church, “in the primary meaning of that important Christian word.”²⁰⁹

There is a similarity with biblical images and Lathrop notes the correspondence to the pattern of events at Sinai. The structure evokes the great assembly of the return from exile and anticipates the gathering of all nations to Zion.²¹⁰ In the New Testament account, the Sunday assembly is portrayed as gathered around risen Christ in Scripture and table, as marked by the poured-out Spirit of God, by mutual and eschatological forgiveness in the *ekklesia*, as coming to Jesus’ miraculous meal, and as sent out in his mission to gather the world.²¹¹ The outline of these actions, the structure or pattern of worship - the *ordo* - has an important role, and it is something that is shared among Christians.²¹² Moreover, the basic building blocks of liturgical structure – biblical texts, preaching and sacraments, hymns, prayers, calendars, and creeds – are all essentially communal in nature.²¹³

The mode of assembly may be often influenced by cultural norms that stand behind the gathering. In the same way, the early church draw on the gathering in synagogue or the extended household gatherings – patterns of philosophical societies, voluntary associations, that were frequent in Hellenistic culture²¹⁴ – and provided a pattern for a house church.²¹⁵ The ecclesiology from below also takes into account a historical and cultural conditioning of the church. Therefore, both of them face the same question. Who decides what local cultural elements are to

²⁰⁷ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*, p. 23.

²⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 39.

²⁰⁹ Ibid, p. 43.

²¹⁰ Ibid, p. 40.

²¹¹ Ibid, p. 40.

²¹² Ibid, p. 40.

²¹³ The local assembly by its participation, by its communal mode of songs and prayers around Scripture reading, meal keeping, and bathing, is being transformed into a primary witness to the identity of God and the identity of the world before God. Ibid, p. 49.

²¹⁴ Ibid, p. 30.

²¹⁵ Lathrop argues that the liturgical locality is important, and that the excess of symbolic meaning usually remains larger than this cultural projection of ourselves. Ibid, p. 29.

be rejected or transformed? Lathrop's answer is somewhat simple: "the church does".²¹⁶ That is, the local assembly, by faithful life in the gospel, perceives how much God loves this place and how the local cultures bear witness to God. But it also perceives, in its struggle, fidelity and mutual conversation over generations, how much this local place is in need of being saved, what requires reorientation and what requires rejection.²¹⁷

3.3.2. Communion of assemblies

Term "assembly" or "church" is used for the local gathering but also for the more-than-local, "ecumenical" reality of the Christian movement.²¹⁸ Their linguistic use in the New Testament and in the early centuries testifies to universal church, and this idea cannot be simply rejected.²¹⁹ At the same time, the local church cannot be understood as a lesser emanation of the universal church, as unworthy local matter, at some distance from the ideal.²²⁰ How should the unity be conceived face to face of local inculturated realities and often considerable differences?

Lathrop uses the *ordo* as a basis for unity or communion of assemblies. The liturgical assembly can be a sign and a symbol of such an unity, for its *ordo* is shared among Christians. Simultaneously, there are many things that Christians received and that flows across denominational lines, to cite few examples: the order of the celebration of the Eucharist and examples of ways that order has been locally and faithfully unfolded, the canon of the books of the Scriptures, patterns and examples of faithful preaching, patterns and examples for the eucharistic prayer at the assembly's table, patterns of the forgiveness of sins...²²¹

According to Lathrop, sign of communion among churches are patterns, principles, and mutual challenges, not fixed texts, certainly not full liturgies.²²² However, the unity does not only concern the links among the people within the particular assembly, but as well links with other such assemblies, in the same town or throughout the world and the relationships to the

²¹⁶ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*, p. 71.

²¹⁷ Ibid, p. 71.

²¹⁸ Ibid, p. 50.

²¹⁹ The central activities of an assembly are enacted in an essentially communal context. Even, if one prays in solitude, in his room, or meditates on Scriptures, the communal context of such activities has always to be recalled.

²²⁰ Ibid, p. 51.

²²¹ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*, p. 58.

²²² Liturgical uniformity or universal validity is not an accurate tool to measure the liturgical celebration, rather it is necessary to ask about "the wholeness and integrity of signs of water, word, bread, wine, assembly, leadership as these things appropriately correspond to both biblical meaning and local culture." Ibid, p. 65.

worldwide “assembly.”²²³ Lathrop then poses an important question that should always be present in a reflection on the worship. What does it mean to celebrate liturgy with such a communal context, where the “we” of liturgical texts does not mean only people present at that moment, but also all other assemblies and by extension the whole world? What consequences does this “we” have? How does our practice influence our relations with other assemblies and churches?

3.4. Conclusion

The ecclesiology from below approaches the church as a concrete, historical, existential community. Its emphasis on God as Spirit present in the midst of the community allows for freedom, and encourages unity in diversity. This approach asks at the same time for some guidelines on how to recognise the Spirit’s activity in history. The method of the ecclesial discernment can be helpful in finding the answers that are responsive to God’s will. It rests on the presupposition that Spirit is present in the community, it asks to involve the whole body of faithful into common decision-making and at the same time it is in constant dialogue with the whole tradition of the church.

Similarly, liturgical ecclesiology emphasizes the existential community, a community gathered for worship around Scripture, meal and bath. Although, it will not emphasize too much the historical dimension and the development over centuries, the tradition is an important dialogue partner and a ground, from which to view assembly’s activities critically. It starts from the concrete local assembly – a gathered people for worship – that is, also from below, which is common to both approaches.

On the one hand, liturgical approach is stronger in the sense that it offers broader basis for unity of churches, since by its nature it will avoid questions of structure and organisation of the church. It looks for the unity among the people of the assembly and subsequently for links with all the other assemblies. The meaning of local church is challenged and redefined across denominational and national boundaries. On the other hand, dialogue with tradition and the commonalities, patterns and structures in liturgy will strengthen the need for unity much more, than it is apparent from principles of historical ecclesiology.

The *ordo* of the liturgy can offer a basis for grasping the Christian unity in a more constructive way than principles for historical ecclesiology. Although at some points this approach leads to similar results. The concrete issues like a faithful local inculturation of liturgy, or question about the essential elements of the authentic church, are to be decided in a community. Similarly, it

²²³ Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy People: a liturgical ecclesiology*, p. 5.

can face the difficulties when the framework of whole church – communal and collegial dimension – is forgotten.

4. CONCLUSION

The principles of historical ecclesiology provide basis for critical appreciation of the developing and changing character of the church. They allow for freedom and diversity within the church that is not necessarily contradicting the unity of the whole church. Rather, all churches are encouraged to appreciate the other and to trust that God as Spirit is at work there – so that the diversity be not perceived as dangerous and threatening.

The *Christian Community in History* does not yet deal with principles of unity in a positive way, and Christian unity is made more apparent in contrast with other religions. At the same time the nature of historically conscious principles give some hints about the coming volume, a substantial and constructive conclusion of the present two. There, the nature and limits of ecclesial pluralism will most probably have to be addressed. Simultaneously, Haight mentioned the *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* as a possible model to build on.

Haight's principles provide a solid and systematic account for constructive ecclesiology that is historically sensitive. They have a high potential to credibly address present problems that the church living in the world is facing; they can initiate discussion on the nature and meaning of denominational divisions but also are not cut off from and respect the living tradition of the church. Nevertheless, they leave us with expectations from the coming volume, which will have to make them more explicit.

ČÁST TŘETÍ:
CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY
IN HISTORY - ECCLESIAL EXISTENCE

1. CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN HISTORY - ECCLESIAL EXISTENCE

1.1. Introduction

The *Christian Community in History, Ecclesial Existence* is an essay in transdenominational ecclesiology. It was published after previous two volumes of historical ecclesiology explored the developments of church across history and tried to identify the principles that are at work in every church at any given time. These principles are here employed to characterise a transdenominational church, a church that cuts across all the churches and that can be understood as their inner core.

The *raison d'être* of this volume is to capture this common apostolic dimension shared by all Christian churches that Haight calls the ecclesial existence and on its basis to encourage churches to enter into partial communion with each other.

1.2. Transdenominational ecclesiology

Most of theological disciplines can be nowadays characterised as cross-cutting, eclectic and cross-confessional. This is a result of many changes and developments in the increasingly interconnected world. Firstly, it is the presence and mutual encounter of different cultures and traditions that challenges old concepts and bring about better acceptance of pluralism. Secondly, the centre of gravity of Christianity is shifting from Europe and North America to other continents. Theology thus has to encompass different accents, topics and experiences that exercise influence on its reflection. Similarly, the inculturation of the church outside the West is accompanied by fragmentation of churches.²²⁴ Finally, despite the fragmentation, the ecumenical movement shows its vitality and there is a growing demand for a statement on what “every member of World Council of Churches share in common.”²²⁵ All these developments provide occasions for new initiatives in ecclesiology.

Unfortunately, facing these challenges ecclesiology is more often concerned with defining, drawing lines and defending the identity of the church that is producing it. Haight says that contrary to these developments, ecclesiology “remains tribal compared with other theological

²²⁴ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*. New York: Continuum, 2008, p. IX.

²²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 12.

disciplines.”²²⁶ What is needed is an ecclesiology that would try to capture the common nature of the Christian church across history and in different contexts. In order to achieve this task, Haight proposes a transdenominational ecclesiology, which wants to portray the common nature shared by all Christian churches. It is not an attempt to create a competitive ecclesiology to denominational ecclesiologies. Instead, it should relate to them as a description of what churches share in common.

The previous two volumes of *Christian Community in History* have brought to attention principles of historical ecclesiology that are perennial, that is, they can be found at work in any church across history. Transdenominational ecclesiology is then using these principles and by means of constructive comparative method it tries to establish what churches share in common.²²⁷ Haight summarises them into four principles:

- 1) Church in two mutually influencing languages - The church is constituted in a two-fold relationship, to God and to the world. These two relationships in their turn require two distinct languages to describe the church.²²⁸
- 2) Sacramental principle – God deals with human beings through church.²²⁹
- 3) Mystagogical principle – Human experience responds to God through the church.²³⁰
- 4) “Commonsensual” principle – Insofar as the church is a historical community, it has an organisational structure that is influenced by and in various aspects correlates with the historical dynamics of other social organisations.²³¹

1.2.1. The Object of Transdenominational Ecclesiology

The object of transdenominational ecclesiology - the transdenominational church - is conceived

²²⁶ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 4.

²²⁷ “The transition from the historical to the constructive ecclesiology is negotiated by a historical phenomenology that recognises and raises up principles and ecclesiological constants that are found to be continuously operative in the church across its historical incarnations.” Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. XI.

²²⁸ Ibid, p. 31.

²²⁹ Haight uses Calvin's principle of incarnation or accommodation: God has chosen to deal with people through the historically organised church. It does not exclude God's work in human subjectivity, although the church as organisation assumes considerable importance in his vision. EE, p. 32.

²³⁰ Ibid, p. 33.

²³¹ Theology, religion and ecclesiology, says Haight, tend to generate absolute patterns of thought that resists critical reflection. To challenge this transcendental contentment, he wants to introduce a level of critical reflection by applying to church and ecclesiology “a framework of social consciousness and social construction of reality.” Ibid, p. 34.

as a foundational element of every church.²³² It subsists in actual concrete churches and can be understood as their fundamental core or a common possession of all churches. At this point Haight has to answer probably the most common objection, that the object of this ecclesiology actually does not exist, because no one belongs to a common church but only to a particular.

Although it is true that the object of transdenominational ecclesiology is a construct, the denominational ecclesiologies as well refer to an abstraction when they work with the universal church. This is a similar theological construct, only it is created from a dimension of the particular churches taken abstractly. Haight asserts that the object of transdenominational ecclesiology cannot be found in the “transcendental ecclesiological consciousness of the Western church, the Eastern church, or any individual church, but must be found through a historical phenomenological method that tries to embrace the whole Christian movement.”²³³

Transdenominational ecclesiology has therefore the same logical status as any denominational ecclesiology. It has to be emphasised that it is not a plan for a merger or federation of churches and it does not take any position towards such attempts. It tries to develop an understanding of the church that, to a degree in which it is accepted by churches, points to bonds of unity across differences.²³⁴ It has dialectical status and an ideological function - it should reflect unity and encourage differences.²³⁵

1.2.2. The Method of Transdenominational Ecclesiology

The aim of transdenominational ecclesiology is to characterise the common nature and the characteristics shared by all Christian churches all over the world. Given the constant changes this effort is an ongoing process. The method of transdenominational ecclesiology has to be comparative, normative and apologetic.

1. It must seek - by comparison, contrast synthesis - a broad understanding that represents various ecclesiologies.²³⁶
2. It cannot be limited just to negotiations of a church committee. On the contrary, it must

²³² Transdenominational church is not a particular church but foundational element of every church or what all churches share in common. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 11.

²³³ Ibid, p. XI.

²³⁴ For example, the baptism can be administered in different ways, one function of oversight and regulation of community life may take different political forms. Ibid, p. 11.

²³⁵ Ibid, p. 12.

²³⁶ Haight sometimes uses the term “constructive comparative ecclesiology”.

be able to assert how things should be.²³⁷

3. It has to be self-explanatory. The importance of this dimension of the method appears clearly when it is oriented towards outsiders. The message and explanations should appeal to common or familiar experience.²³⁸

The sources of transdenominational ecclesiology are diverse, but they can be divided into two major groups. The historical sources include New Testament, both as a historical account of church's development and as a witness to revelation; the history of the church, and the history of ecclesiology. All the official documents of churches that give normative expression to the constitution of a church, as well as the interpretations of these documents in the writings of theologians then belong to the second group of contemporary sources. There are as well two special sources - the documents of World Council of Churches Faith and Order commission, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM) and *Nature and Mission of the Church* (NMC).²³⁹ Their specific nature stems out of their wide acceptance by a variety of churches.

1.3. Ecclesial existence

Ecclesial existence can be characterised as a mode of Christian life that subsists in all the churches and spans two millennia.²⁴⁰ Haight describes it as an abstraction from particular churches, which points to the most actual or lived experience. It cannot be reduced to a set of doctrines or institutional forms, nor it can be identified with the patterns of worship and ethics articulated by particular churches. Rather, ecclesial existence points to the latent apostolic church that subsists in the church today across denominations.²⁴¹ From the definition of ecclesial existence Haight introduces the main thesis of his work, namely a statement that “the ecclesial existence provides grounds for partial communion among churches.”²⁴²

²³⁷ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 18.

²³⁸ The language used by transdenominational ecclesiology should be broad, deliberately generalised, inclusive and includes theological synthesis derived from New Testament. It should as well use frequent recourse to principle of functionality. In other words, this method should be using the “functioning reality rather than the formal juridical, canonical terms describing it. Juridicism or fixation on historical institutions as absolute sets up permanent blockage to elementary religious and theological perception.” Ibid, p. 22.

²³⁹ Firstly, both BEM and NMC embody the representative dialogue among churches and are constructive proposals on the basis of Scripture. Secondly, they have generated very positive responses from a wide variety of churches. Ibid, p. 16

²⁴⁰ In other words, it is the “corporate level of being a Christian that is shared by all Christians.” Ibid, p. XIV.

²⁴¹ Ibid, p. 275.

²⁴² Ibid, p. 270.

How and on what grounds is it possible? To develop the thesis, Haight uses two lines of arguments that are closely linked. On the one hand, he stresses the existential dimension of the church and characterises the ecclesial existences as an ecclesial spirituality. He says that this response is in its core communitarian, it is analogous to the one of apostolic church and thus it is something that subsists in all churches.²⁴³ On the other hand, he argues by depth and complexity of apostolic tradition that allow for pluralism. Haight affirms that no single church can exhaust the possibilities of the apostolic tradition. Churches have to acknowledge their deficiency in preserving the apostolic tradition and have to recognise and appreciate the values represented in other traditions.²⁴⁴ The complexity of the apostolic tradition then encompasses wide variety of church forms and church structures, and in turn makes the partial communion possible despite existing differences.

1.3.1. Spirituality and Ecclesial Existence

Christianity in the first generation was a movement that was characterised by spirituality of attachment or following of Jesus. In the next generation this movement through the complex process of objectification became a church that in turn started to form the ecclesial spirituality of its new members. “What begun as an objectification of the life in the Spirit of Jesus shifted to become the objective medium initiating new members into an ecclesial-Jesus spirituality.”²⁴⁵

The ecclesial existence understood as spirituality points at the Christian response to Jesus Christ in community. It brings forward “the existential or living substance underlying the community structures and the objective understanding that accompanies them.”²⁴⁶ It understands the Christian response dynamically, as a way of life and as commitments. Initiation of new members and handing over the spirituality still happens within the constitutional forms of the church, but they themselves become less important.

Although the ecclesial spirituality was in history actualised in various forms, it shows similarities in Christian experience across centuries and it is analogously the same as the response of Christians in apostolic period that is represented in the New Testament. The common ecclesial existence is thus apostolic in its character, it is shared in common and can serve as basis for partial communion among churches.

²⁴³ The term spirituality as it is employed by Haight refers to encompassing logic of how people live their lives with implicit or explicit reference to ultimate reality. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 271.

²⁴⁴ Every form of church structure mediates different values that are not fully represented in other structural forms. Ibid, p. 291

²⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 274.

²⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 272.

1.3.2. Ecclesial existence and partial communion

Haight asserts that the nature of ecclesial existence provides grounds for partial communion. What does he mean by partial communion? Does it mean setting an easily achievable goal that will not demand more effort or is it rather an unattainable ideal that is ultimately not interesting and does not have any weight in the life of churches? Can the ecclesial existence serve as grounding for an ecclesiological policy of seeking partial communion?

Full communion

In simple terms, communion among churches means unity among differences. There are many stages or degrees of communion, but for the purpose of this work the partial communion is best explained by contrasting it with the full communion. This can be described as mutual recognition of one another by different churches in every essential aspect of what it means to be a church.²⁴⁷ Existing differences are not considered as substantial. The Assembly of World Council of Churches in Canberra stated that the four characteristics of full communion are common confession of apostolic faith, common sacramental life revolving around baptism and Eucharist, a set of ministries in the churches that was mutually recognised, and a common mission to evangelise the world.²⁴⁸ Full communion basically means that churches are able to recognise in themselves one, holy, catholic and apostolic church in its fullness.

Partial communion

Although partial communion presupposes mutual recognition, it admits some substantial differences. What are the limits and when can the partial communion be achieved? Is there anything that can establish this communion or on the contrary prevent it? According to Haight partial communion is a fluid historical concept that has many degrees. The constant shifting of history, he says, prevents from defining a priori nature or degree of differences that would allow the communion.

In this situation, transdenominational ecclesiology can propose to churches “positive reasons for entering into a relationship of communion with another church which may be seriously different from themselves.”²⁴⁹ At the same time, the churches have to want to affirm the other churches and there has to be a will for partial communion.²⁵⁰ They must strive to transcend its own self-understanding in order to grasp the apostolic ecclesial existence despite its otherness.

²⁴⁷ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 276.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p. 276.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 277.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. 279.

Haight admits that any church can resist communion simply on the grounds of otherness. In the background of this decision is a rationale that implicitly sets up its ecclesial form to be the norm of apostolic ecclesial existence. This stance mistakenly takes one part of apostolic tradition to represent the whole.²⁵¹ At the same time, he encourages churches to work on relationships that result in partial communion. “Such a communion will be deficient, but this deficiency will remind churches that they could constantly do better.”²⁵² However, partial communion is important in that it is formal recognition of bonds that they have together.

²⁵¹ Haight equals it to a statement: “we embody the integrity of faith and others do not.” Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 279.

²⁵² *Ibid*, p. 280.

2. CONCLUSION

Haight's transdenominational ecclesiology is shifting the focus in ecclesiology. Based on the principles of historical ecclesiology, it wants to offer a description of what churches share in common and deepen the understanding of the church. This volume takes on similar approach as the documents BEM and NMC. Its primary goal is to develop a constructive account of the church that is shared by all churches, and not to focus on the sources of divisions. Churches have to realise that none of them actually comprises the fullness of apostolic tradition. Some church forms and structures embody better some values than others, and this general deficiency provides space for mutual learning.

Transdenominational ecclesiology wants to portray the ecclesial existence that subsists in all churches and constitutes the continuity across history with the churches of apostolic period.²⁵³ At its base, ecclesial existence can be understood as a way of life within the Christian community or by the community itself. It thus offers churches positive reasons for entering into partial communion and encourages them to step its own borders in the faith that Spirit of God is present in their quest for unity.

Haight does not offer a set model or criteria to determine when the partial communion happens, he says that it is a fluid and dynamic model and some churches will be able to affirm the communion at different stages than other ones. Although the partial communion is far from the ideal, at least it means formal recognition of bonds between churches that in turn encourages them to work towards the fuller communion.

In the third volume, Haight focuses on the existential function of various church institutions that allows him more intensively to explore the possibilities for communion. In the background of this volume is the fundamental trust in the work and the presence of the Spirit of God who calls for unity in the church. *Ecclesial Existence* then brings new emphasis on the existential dimension of the church that is similar to the approach of liturgical ecclesiology explored in the first part of this essay. The partial communion can be analogically based on common patterns, principles and functionality in an intense dialogue with the New testament and the apostolic church of first century.

Haight identifies two issues that particularly hinder the process of entering into communion. On the one hand he sees the limitations of language and imagery used in denominational ecclesiologies and by means of transdenominational ecclesiology tries to identify more uniting concepts. He especially warns against employing juridical and clear-cut terms that can create

²⁵³ Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 2. Ecclesial Existence*, p. XIV

many obstacles. Instead he suggests that the identity of churches needs to be radically redefined in a more inclusive way, for example by using similar images and exploring their ambivalence in the New Testament.²⁵⁴

On the other hand, by appreciating and emphasising the complexity of apostolic tradition, Haight can shift the understanding of differences between churches. For these, once they are portrayed against the richness of tradition over two millennia, appear to be minor and are not of a nature that would exclude partial communion. Haight says that the only thing that can exclude communion is sin. Where exactly this sinful responsibility lies is a subject of various analysis, but the question should lie heavily on the conscience of the leaders of the churches.²⁵⁵

Finally, the third volume of *Christian Community in History, Ecclesial Existence* is a work in constructive ecclesiology. Together with high Christology of *Jesus Symbol of God* and the method of theology in *Dynamics of Theology* that all use the method from below they are an effort to remain faithful to apostolic faith by entering into dialogue with our world today.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁴ These two characteristics, deliberate vagueness of object-reference and analogical imagination should not be conceived as weaknesses, but rather as ways of protecting legitimate diversity within unity. It can potentially bring in new ecclesiological imagination and open up possibilities for mutual recognitions. Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History: vol 3. Ecclesial Existence*, p. 22

²⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 232.

²⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 292.

3. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 1. Historical ecclesiology.* London: Continuum, 2004.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol. 2. Comparative ecclesiology.* New York: Continuum, 2005.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). *Christian Community in History. vol 3. Ecclesial Existence.* New York: Continuum, 2008

Haight, Roger (S.J.). "Historical Ecclesiology. Part I. An Essay on Method in the Study of the Church." *Science et Esprit* XXXIX/1 (1987): 27-46.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). "Historical Ecclesiology. Part II. Axioms Flowing from an Historical-Theological Method." *Science et Esprit* XXXIX/3 (1987): 345-374.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). "On Systematic Ecclesiology." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, Fall (1992): 220-238.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). "Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives. Author's response", *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 387-397.

Haight, Roger (S.J.). "Systematic Ecclesiology." *Science et Esprit* XLV/3 (1993): 253- 281 .

Haight, Roger (S.J.). Towards an ecclesiology from below. In « *Imaginer la théologie catholique* », *Permanence et transformation de la foi en attendant Jésus-Christ. Mélanges offerts à Ghislain Lafont.* Roma : Centro Studi S. Anselmo, 2000: 413-436.

Secondary sources

Congar, Yves (O.P.). *I Believe in the Holy Spirit.* vol 1. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

Congar, Yves (O.P.). *I Believe in the Holy Spirit.* vol 2. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

Fahey Michael A. "Church." In Francis Schüssler Fiorenza & John P. Galvin (eds.), *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives* Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1992.

Fahey, Michael A. "Ecumenical Ecclesiology." In *The Gift of the Church : A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield*, O.S.B. eds. Granfield, P., Phan, P. C. Collegette (Minn.): Liturgical Press, 2000: 111-128.

Fitzgerald, Patrick J. (S.J.). "A Model for Dialogue: Cyprian of Carthage on Ecclesial Discernment." *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 236 – 253.

Grenz, Stanley J. "The Social God and the Relational Self: Toward a Theology of the Imago Dei

in the Postmodern Context" *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 24 (2002): 33-57.

- Imbelli, Robert. "Preserving the Church's Identity." *America*. 2/7/2005, Vol. 192, Issue 4: 35-37.
- Lathrop, Gordon W. *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Lathrop, Gordon W. *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Ress, Mary J. *Ecofeminist Theology*. New York: Orbis Books, 2006.
- Rodríguez, Pedro. "Theological method for Ecclesiology." In *The Gift of the Church : A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.* eds. Granfield, P., Phan, P. C. Collegeville (Minn.): Liturgical Press, 2000: 129-156.
- Ruddy, Christopher. "The Boundaries, Please." *America*. 8/1/2005, Vol. 193 Issue 3: 22-25.
- The Nature and Mission of the Church - A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement*. Faith and Order Paper no. 198. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2005.
- The Windsor Report 2004*. The Lambeth Commission on Communion. Available online: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/> (consulted 26.6.2007).
- Wood, Susan K. "Church as Communion." In *The Gift of the Church : A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.* eds. Granfield, P., Phan, P. C. Collegeville (Minn.): Liturgical Press, 2000: 159-191.
- Wood, Susan K. Sullivan, Francis A. Pauw, Amy P. and McBrien, Richard P. "Roger Haight, (S.J.) Christian community in history: four perspectives." *Horizons* 32, no. 2, Fall (2005): 374-386.
- Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.